S. HRG. 99-836

WOMEN IN TRANSITION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING THE HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT OF REENTRY OF WOMEN INTO EDUCATION AND THE LABOR FORCE

APRIL 30, 1986

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

63-226 O WASHINGTON : 1986

S541-76

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
THOMAS M. ROLLINS, *Minority Staff Director/Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986

	Page
American Association of Retired Persons, prepared statement	150
Fossedal, Dr. Ruth, dean of community services, Genessee Community College, Batavia, NY; Charlotte Carney Gore, vocational education equity administrator, division of vocational, adult and community education, Florida Department of Education, Tampa, FL; and Dr. Anne L. Bryant, executive director, American Association of University Women, Washington, DC	7
Prepared statement of:	
Dr. Fossedal	10
Ms. Gore	25
Dr. Bryant	39
Hawkins, Hon. Paula, a U.S. Senator from the State of Florida, prepared statement	6
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement	4
Kerry, Hon. John F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts	18
Prepared statement	18
Marano, Cynthia, executive director, Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc., Washington, DC; Virginia P. Kelson, executive director, the Phoenix Institute, Salt Lake City, UT; and Myrna F. Young, executive director, Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc., Buffalo, NY	69
Prepared statement of:	
Ms. Marano	78
Ms. Kelson	111
Ms. Young	133
Metzenbaum, Hon. Howard M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio, prepared statement	6
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island, prepared statement	105

WOMEN IN TRANSITION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Orring G. Hatch (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Hatch, Simon, Grassley, Kennedy, Kerry, Pell, Dodd, and Nickles.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

The CHAIRMAN. In November 1983, the Labor and Human Resources Committee held a hearing entitled "Women in Transition," which focused on the plight of displaced homemakers. The committee heard first hand from three women whose lives were drastically changed when their husbands suddenly were no longer a part of the family. Overnight, they were expected to be both homemaker and breadwinner. The immediate need for training, education, and support for women thrust into such a predicament was the impetus for a package of legislation I introduced in the fall of 1983 with support from other members of this committee. Several of those measures have become law.

Our interest did not end with the passage of these bills. We remain particularly concerned about women who have chosen to be homemakers only to find themselves some years later with a family to support on their own—women like a constituent from Salt Lake City who wrote to me recently. Married for more than 11 years, the mother of five children, she found herself burdened not only with the day-to-day worries that any mother faces, but also with a pile of debts. Her rusty secretarial skills were insufficient to declare independence from the alimony of her ex-husband or from the generosity of her own parents. While I was glad that I could refer her to a program like the Phoenix Institute in Salt Lake, it was clear that the problems confronting displaced homemakers, and indeed many women resuming education or reentering the labor force, needed still further attention and investigation.

The charts displayed around the room here illustrate the fact that an increasing number of women are pursuing educational goals or are entering the work force.

Now, as the pie chart over on your left shows, many women must obtain employable skills and enter the work force out of economic necessity. Two-thirds of the women in the labor force are

single, divorced or separated, widowed, or have husbands who earn less than $15,000 per year.

The labor force participation rate, which is the percentage of all women age 16 and older who are either employed or who are looking for work, has increased steadily since 1950 according to the second chart. Of particular interest is the yellow line representing married women. Entry into the labor force has been the most rapid among this particular group.

The third chart indicates that women comprise an increasing share of many diverse occupations, several of which are considered nontraditional. The chart lists only the 10 occupations having the greatest increase in female workers during the 4-year period between 1980 and 1984. I like to think that this indicates that more and more women are being given the chance to choose an occupation they want, not one to which they are assigned.

The last chart shows the increase in the number of college degrees awarded to women as a percent of the total number of degrees awarded nationally by our Nation's colleges and universities. Education is the key to marketplace opportunity, mobility, and advancement as well as an intrinsic benefit to the family, the community, and to the society that we live in.

The charts, however, do not give us the complete picture. We have called today's hearing to hear testimony about these trends and how Federal policy can facilitate opportunities for women who either choose or must reenter educational programs and the labor force.

We have asked our witnesses to discuss three areas in particular: One, the remaining barriers faced by women in these two arenas; two, how Federal programs like JTPA and the Carl Perkins Act, as well as other efforts which are State, locally, or privately sponsored, have helped women; and, three, their recommendations and suggestions.

While we will not have time today to fully analyze the recommendations, I am confident that the testimony will provide us with an important list of options and a framework for a second series of legislative initiatives.

The entrance of women into education and into the labor force is not a phenomenon of the 1970's or 1980's. Since Oberlin College opened its doors to women in 1833, women have sought higher education. It is interesting to note the percentage of women in the labor force nearly tripled in the 30 years between 1870 and the turn of the century, making women a significant and permanent part of the labor force. Public policy, it seems to me, has responded to this change; it did not precipitate it. It is not Government's role to prescribe or manage individual choices, but rather to ensure opportunity for women in all walks of life. We can do this through continued economic growth and by removing the obstacles that really are standing in the way of women today.

I am hopeful that this hearing will lead us to understand more about this and how to help women in our society who are in transition and who are really struggling with the complexities of life in our society today.

Senator Simon, why do we not turn to you.

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

First of all, I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for holding the hearing. I looked at the charts with interest. Let me just lobby my colleagues here. One of the reasons for the progress for women has been title IX. Women have moved up, in quotes, from average earnings of 59 cents on a dollar to 62 cents, but those under the age of 30 have moved up to 85 cents on the dollar. A good reason for that is title IX. The *Grove City* decision really does imperil that.

I hope somehow we can work out an agreement and, before too long, move to overturn Grove City.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator would yield on that, there is absolutely no problem with extending title IX institutionwide. We have agreed to that from the beginning. It is the extension to every aspect of our society that the Grove City bill has called for that makes it so difficult, because that goes far beyond what really title IX was intended to do to begin with.

But we could extend title IX institutionwide in 5 seconds on the Senate floor, and I cannot understand why we get into these ideological logjams that really are detrimental to women.

Senator SIMON. Yes. If we can work out some——

The CHAIRMAN. I would be happy to work with the Senator.

Senator SIMON [continuing]. Answer so we can move. I am not suggesting, though, that we move beyond the pre-Grove City situation, but that we go back precisely to where we were pre-Grove City so we can continue to move ahead

The CHAIRMAN. I would be happy to do that.

Senator SIMON. But again, I commend you for holding these hearings and look forward to hearing the witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Grassley.

Senator GRASSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, thank you for holding the hearings on this very important issue, particularly since we just last year rewrote the Nation's Vocational Education Program. In that we created a new set-aside in Federal funds to assist single parents and homemakers. That Carl Perkins Act is a response to the situation in which we find ourselves now with a growing number of women wanting to and needing to and, as a matter of freedom, having the right to go back into the workplace.

Women who have spent the majority of their lives raising families and working without pay in the home suddenly must enter the work force and find themselves with insurmountable barriers because of outdated skills, limited work experience, and even age discrimination.

A growing number of women who are faced with the responsibility of providing the sole means of support for their children have needs for child care and transportation to even allow them to enter the training programs to obtain marketable skills that will provide economic security.

During the markup of that bill that I have already referred to, I had great interest in providing enough flexibility for States to design programs best tailored to the needs of single parents and homemakers. I am hopeful that the new bill will improve the quality and accessibility of programs for these women, as well as providing transportation and child care to women to participate in vocational programs.

The Job Training Partnership Act, which replaced the CETA Program, is also providing service delivery for training needs for women. Through the Job Training Partnership Act Program, women are receiving counseling and support services as well as training that has a critical link with the private sector job market.

As we finish action on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act this spring, we have also made an attempt to address some of the barriers that women face. For the first time, we allow less than half-time students to be eligible for financial assistance, recognizing that many students are nontraditional adults that have other family and job responsibilities.

So, Mr. Chairman, considering the follow-on of this hearing of these three major changes in legislation, increasing opportunities for women to receive training so that they can be competitive in the job market, I look forward to hearing the testimony from these distinguished witnesses this morning to help determine other ways in which Congress can be sensitive to women in transition, as we fine-tune Federal programs to meet that need.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Grassley.

Let us turn to Senator Kennedy.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have my full statement placed in the record.

I welcome the fact that we are holding a hearing on this important subject matter. I imagine we are going to have an opportunity to hear once again about the importance of advanced educational opportunities for women in our society. These opportunities open up new horizons for many who have not had that chance in a variety of different professions such as the importance of training, the importance of day care, and the limitations which have been placed on women in our society with the *Grove City* decision. Clearly, Gove City continues to hamper the opportunities for women in important areas of education.

I am looking forward to hearing the testimony this morning, and I think it is enormously valuable and useful for us to collect the latest information on what the facts are in terms of women in the workplace. I welcome our witnesses.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Kennedy. Your statement is in the record.

We will also place in the record at this point the statement of Senator Howard Metzenbaum who has a conflicting committee meeting this morning and wishes he could be here and Senator Hawkins.

[The prepared statements of Senators Kennedy, Metzenbaum, and Hawkins follow:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

Senator KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the barriers that exist for women entering or reentering education and the work force. It is not only the responsibility of the Federal Government but also of the private sector to recognize existing barriers and to work hard to eliminate them so that women can attain their fullest potential as individuals and as members of this Nation's work force. I look forward to hearing testimony from our distinguished panelists and I would like to express my interest in working with Senator Hatch to implement the recommendations that will be put before us here today.

The critical needs for all women in education and employment today are educational equity, elimination of discriminaton, movement into nontraditional and higher paying jobs, and availability of adequate support services. These, along with a healthy economy, are the key to women being successful in the workplace.

A major route upward and out of the lowest paid jobs is education, Median annual earnings of women increase substantially the higher their educational attainment. More women are completing high school and going on to college. In 1940, only 29% of women workers, age 18 to 64, had completed 4 years of high school. In 1981, 47.7% had completed high school. As well, women now account for more than half of the enrollment in higher education institutions.

The women's bureau tells us that although public schools have been coeducational for more than a century, the structures, behaviors, and policies that limit opportunities and aspirations of girls and women still occur in the educational system. Some school counselors have discouraged girls and women from considering courses and careers in nontraditional fields, particularly in mathematics, science and vocational education. Over the past decade, several laws have been enacted to end sexism in education and to open economic opportunities to women.

Title XI of the education amendments of 1972 promotes educational equity for women and girls in all federally assisted education programs. Compliance with the law has been favorable. Significant increases have occurred in the enrollment of women in graduate and professional schools such as law and medicine. At the secondary level, sex segregated physical education classes have virtually disappeared. But the success of this antidiscrimination law has been short lived. Without the adoption of the Civil Rights Act of 1985, this educational equity for women and girls may not be restored.

The Women's Educational Equity Act was enacted in 1974 to promote educational equity for women and girls and provides grants and contracts to agencies and organizations to provide develop materials and model programs to achieve equity in education.

The Vocational Education Act mandates certain activities to eliminate sex bias, stereotyping, and discrimination in federally funded vocational education programs.

Women accounted for more than half of both the gain in the working age population and in the civilian labor force over the past decade. Their participation rose from 43% in 1970 to 52% in 1981. Despite this increase in participation, most women continue to be employed in traditional occupations that typically provide low wages. Many women who work full time remain permanently in jobs that pay minimum wage. Such jobs if worked full-time year round would pay less than the $7,693 poverty threshold for a family of 3.

Over 40% of all poor families are those maintained by women. Almost 68% of all families maintained by women contain minor children. It is clear that the elimination of educational discrimination is one of the keys to unlocking the barriers that prevent women from obtaining nontraditional and higher paying jobs. Nondiscriminatory training programs for women are equally as important. The Job Training Partnership Act is the main Federal training program for disadvantaged individuals and was created to help economically disadvantaged individuals including women to enter and or reenter the job market.

Along with training, it is imperative that we recognize the critical support services that are necessary for women to remain as full-time workers in the labor force. The most important of these support services is child care. In 1984, 52% of women with children under the age of 6 were working yet the Federal support for child care, particularly for low income women has decreased. Title XX of the Social Security Act which provides the largest portion of aid to States for child care has been cut by 21%. In this Congress I introduced several bills to provide the resources to develop demonstration child care programs and services for parents who attend institutions of higher education and for parents of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years. We have also made some progress in providing consideration of child care costs for college students who apply for student aid in the reauthorization of Higher Education Act. Our progress is small and slow. The time for Federal commitment to child care is long past due. The need for quality child care that is affordable for all parents is now a necessity and is a major key to the economic success of our country.

The closing of the United Nations decade for womend does not signal an end to the battles that must continue to be fought and won for women. We have made some progress over the last 10 years, but we have also lost some important and significant ground in regard to the civil rights protections for women. We must work even more diligently to recapture what we have won over 2 decades and we must

move ahead to break down the remaining impediments to equal education and job opportunities for the women of the United States.

Statement of Senator Howard M. Metzenbaum

Senator Metzembaum. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling this hearing on the subject of Women in Transition. It is a much-needed follow-up on the hearing before this committee in 1983.

"Women in Transition" could be a euphemism for an increasingly difficult problem. Unfortunately, these "women in transition" are too often in fast transit to poverty. They include "displaced homemakers,"—women who have lost their jobs as homemakers and have lost their source of economic support due to divorce, separation, desertion or the death or disability of a spouse.

Barriers to education, employment and self-sufficiency for such displaced homemakers often seem insurmountable—factors relating to age; sex; lack of relevant education and training; shortages of dependent care facilities, and lack of financial resources to pay for such care, anyhow; lack of information about jobs or educational opportunities; lack of student financial aid or adequate counseling; lack of transportation; a sense of despair and low self-esteem.

To add to the problems, health insurance coverage may be terminated with the loss of the primary wage earner. Child support may be insufficient or non-existent. And displaced homemakers may fall through the so-called "safety net" even with respect to federal and state income assistance programs. For example, AFDC is available only until the youngest child reaches 18. Even if she is eligible, a 45–50 year old displaced homemaker has many years to go before she can receive Social Security benefits. SSI is only for needy persons who are 65 and over, blind or disabled. And the Administration budget continues to cut human resource programs—food stamps, medicaid, child nutrition, housing assistance, student aid—which could be helpful.

We have yet to translate our concern about the feminization of poverty into national policies that would treat or prevent the problem.

It seems obvious that solutions can only be found through a coordinated effort. There are some limited federal resources—the Joint Training Partnership Act, and the Vocational Education Act; but the resources of many community, state, and federal agencies will have to be utilized and coordinated in addressing the many problems faced by women in transition.

I appreciate the time and experience all the witnesses are contributing to this hearing, and trust we will have additional insights and perspectives through your expert testimony.

Statement of Senator Paula Hawkins

Senator Hawkins. What should a woman do when she is unexpectedly put in the position of being the lone supporter of herself and her family? How can a family adjust to these changes while maintaining their present standard of living? What are the specific options available to women to help them assure their family's economic survival?

Today 5.6 million women in the United States are asking themselves these questions. Eighty percent of this number are at least 40 years old, and half of them have neither graduated from high school nor worked outside the home.

Our presence here today indicates that positive solutions exist for these women. Women in transition have garnered skills in other areas—skills necessary to raise children and maintain households—"skills for living." To help these women in transition nurture these skills into more economically supportive ones, we in Washington have passed both the Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl Perkins Vocational Educational Act.

Through these laws, we've sought to recognize these women as independent providers willing to accept the tools to help themselves. Our job now is to recognize how we can further help these women. What are the needs of women in transition which have yet to be addressed? What are the shortfalls in existing programs?

Educational programs and policies are probably among the most effective tools. Yet many women are unable to benefit from educational programs due to scheduling conflicts, lack of transportation and child care services, or because they are ineligible to receive financial aid unless they are at least part-time students. Most of these women in transition simply do not have the time to devote to satisfy even this last condition.

Generally, women in transition have been difficult to reach. Many incorrectly believe that these programs are restricted to low-income families. Furthermore, in some instances the Job Training Partnership Act puts too much pressure on women for immediate placement in jobs with high wages. Few women can find child care services cheaply, quickly, or at the sufficient level. Today this Committee will provide oversight on these matters.

If we are able to address these problems we will turn the difficulties into assets, and maximize our success along the way. We must ensure that the millions of women in transition, both now and in the future, will become women on solid ground.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very pleased to have with us this morning three women with outstanding credentials in the field of education: Dr. Ruth Fossedal, former national president of the Displaced Homemakers Network, is currently dean of Community Services of Genessee Community College in Batavia, NY; Ms. Charlotte Gore is the women's program administrator for the State Department of Vocational Education in Florida; and finally, we want to welcome Dr. Anne Bryant who is the new executive director of the American Association of University Women.

We sincerely appreciate all of you being here with us this morning and the efforts that you have put forth to help us on this committee.

Now, before we begin, let us just take a moment to announce that the complete statement of each witness will be included in this very important record in full so you will be free to summarize your testimony, leaving more time for questions.

Why do we not begin with you, Dr. Fossedal?

STATEMENT OF DR. RUTH FOSSEDAL, DEAN OF COMMUNITY SERVICES, GENESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, BATAVIA, NY; CHARLOTTE CARNEY GORE, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION EQUITY ADMINISTRATOR, DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL, ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, TAMPA, FL; AND DR. ANNE L. BRYANT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Good morning. It is a pleasure to be with you in this very important connection between education and economic self-sufficiency which we know is a top priority for Congress.

I would like to begin by telling you about one woman among the hundreds of thousands that have been served by local displaced homemaker programs. At age 40, after 20 years as a full-time homemaker, Rose found herself suddenly widowed with three teenagers to support. Her work experience was very limited. She had very limited income and benefits and knew that she could not pay her mortgage and feed her children. Even her son's part-time job did not help make ends meet.

She was fortunate to learn about a displaced homemakers program at a nearby community college. She went to the program even though she was very frightened and found that she was able to explore some of the options open to her. She was very frightened, of course, of the campus and of the younger students, but through the displaced homemakers center and counselor, she was able to find a part-time job and the supportive group counseling

that she needed to build her self-esteem and help her reenter the educational market.

She now has a part-time job and is continuing school at night with hopes of finishing her associate's degree and moving on to a nearby university.

We know that many women do not have the luxury of reentering education full time or even part time without working, and we know that we need colleges and universities that are responsive to the needs of these women.

Rose was successful because there was a program to help her. Many colleges do not get into these kinds of programs. There are some very significant barriers that we must be aware of: the inaccessibility to colleges due to scheduling patterns; the lack of transportation and child care; the unavailability of credit for life experience; and financial aid for less than part-time students is not yet allowed.

In addition, many instructors are not sensitive to the special needs of these women and at times are not too caring when the women must be absent from class due to family responsibilities.

Fortunately, some systems have begun to address these concerns. The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges has just begun a statewide effort to develop innovative day-care services. The program targets $200,000 to six postsecondary institutions to design and manage different models of providing child care.

In Wisconsin, the Women's Development Center at Waukesha County Technical Institute has an intake counseling program which provides each woman with individual assessment and a plan for reentering school. Child care, emergency funds and support groups are all part of this program.

In Washington State, a toll-free number has been put into effect by the Commission on Vocational Education so that displaced homemakers around the State can receive information and referral to programs.

Although progress has been made, especially through the Perkins Vocational Education Act, there are still a number of areas that need vast improvement and changes. An immediate concern is funding. Unless full funding is maintained, the few gains that we have seen this past year are in jeopardy.

Current funding levels are also inadequate for programs to provide the best possible services. For example, in my small rural area, we have one-and-one-half staff persons in our displaced homemaker/single parent project to serve over three counties. Underfunding is a problem.

We also have a concern about the implementation of the Perkins Act. The provision for community-based organizations to be funded and participate as full members has not been widely implemented. These organizations play a vital role in introducing and preparing reentry women for education and training.

Every college and university must take a look at the accessibility of their course schedules, using such programs as the Saturday College or the Wednesday College.

Another concern is the restriction on AFDC mothers wishing to reenter education. They cannot become self-sufficient economically

unless they can qualify for more than a minimum wage job. Many guidelines penalize them and do not allow them to enter education.

Some of the needs of reentry women have been included in H.R. 3700. These include $15 million for schools to provide direct child care services; the opening up of eligibility for Pell grants and supplemental educational opportunity grants to less than half-time students; enabling full-time and less than half-time students to include transportation and dependent care costs in calculating their financial need; waiving home equity calculations for displaced homemakers.

These and other provisions are essential. Congress can facilitate the reentry of women into education by providing full funding of existing programs and continuing to include equity provisions in every piece of education and employment legislation.

We also request that we ensure equal education opportunity for all by passing the Civil Rights Restoration Act without crippling amendments that do not relate to stamping out discrimination. You must ensure that all people seeking to enter or reenter education and employment programs will be guaranteed an opportunity.

Behind many successful men and women is a displaced homemaker and a mother.

Behind many institutional doors are educational opportunities.

Now is the time to open those doors and ensure accessibility as well as availability.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Fossedal follows:]

STATEMENT OF RUTH FOSSEDAL, DEAN OF COMMUNITY SERVICES,
GENESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, BATAVIA, NEW YORK
TO

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

April 30, 1986

Good morning. I am Ruth Fossedal, Dean of Community Services at Genessee Community College in Batavia, New York. I am also Past President of the Displaced Homemakers Network. The plight of women struggling towards economic self-sufficiency for themselves and their families should be a top priority for Congress, as it is for women's organizations at every level.

Let me tell you about one woman among the hundreds of thousands that have been served by local displaced homemaker programs. At age 40, after 20 years as a full-time homemaker, Rose found herself suddenly widowed with three teenagers to support. Her only work experience in the last 20 years was a brief stint at selling Avon products. A small insurance policy and survivor's benefits simply could not pay the mortgage and feed her children. Even her son's part-time job did not make ends meet.

A friend told her about a new program at the community college for middle-aged and older women re-entering education and employment. In the face of losing not only her home, but also her and her family's dreams for the future, Rose knew she had very few options. But she was frightened- frightened of the imposing campus and frightened of competing with students half her age. With her family's encouragement, she finally made an appointment with the displaced homemaker counselor. The program helped her find a part-time job while she attended classes and provided group counseling to build her self-esteem and coping skills.

That part-time job has led to a full-time job, but the family is still not out of the financial woods. Rose is still in school, however, working on an associate's degree at night, so that she can qualify for a higher paying job. She is no longer frightened.

Like millions of other women, Rose did not re-enter education because she was bored, or looking for fulfillment, but because of the economic reality of today. It is a fact that without education or training, the chances of achieving economic self-sufficiency are, at best, slim. Even with education, many middle-aged and older women re-entering the work force find it nearly impossible to get jobs that will provide them with the economic security they need.

Many women do not have the luxury of re-entering education- full-or parttime- without also working. The loss or reduction of their primary income especially demands this. Therefore, re-entry women need colleges and universities to be responsive to their concerns and to provide them with equal education opportunity.

Rose was successful because there was a program to meet her specific needs. At colleges and universities a number of barriers exist that make it difficult for women to re-enter education. These barriers include:

- inaccessibility due to scheduling patterns

- transportation and child care services
- credit for life experience not available
- financial aid for less than parttime students not allowed

In addition, many instructors are insensitive to the absenteeism of re-entry women because of family responsibilities. Guidelines restricting AFDC mothers from becoming re-entry students are another barrier that needs to be addressed.

Fortunately, some schools and educational systems have begun to implement new strategies for serving re-entry women. The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges has just begun a statewide effort to develop innovative day care services. The program targets $200,000 to six postsecondary institutions to design and manage different models of providing child care for the families of single parents and homemakers enrolled in vocational education.

In Wisconsin, the Women's Development Center at Waukesha County Technical Institute has an intake counseling program which provides each woman with individual assessment and a plan for re-entering school. The program includes counseling, child care, an emergency fund and support groups. The program has been extremely successful in enrolling and retaining re-entry women.

In Washington State, a toll-free number has been put into effect by the Commission on Vocational Education so that displaced homemakers around the state can receive information and referral to the nearest vocational education program.

Although progress has been made, especially through the Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, there are still a number of areas that need vast improvement and changes. An immediate concern is funding for the Perkins Act. Unless full funding is maintained, the few gains that we have seen over the last year are in serious jeopardy. Funding for vocational education and financial aid must be stabilized in order for institutions, organizations and students to benefit.

Current funding levels are inadequate for programs to provide the best possible services. For instance, the displaced homemaker program at my college has only one and a half staff persons to serve three counties. Unfortunately, underfunding and understaffing are the rule and not exception for most programs. In addition, funding must be increased for transportation and child care stipends. Without these services, many women continue to be excluded from education.

We also have a concern about the implementation of the Perkins Act. The provision for community-based organizations to be funded and participate as full partners has not been widely implemented. These organizations play a vital role in introducing and preparing re-entry women for education and training. Ideally,

community-based organizations, vocational institutions and community colleges should be equal partners in planning and delivering comprehensive services.

Every college and university should take a look at the accessibility of their course schedules. Many do not offer a full program in the evenings and on the weekends to accomodate re-entry women and other students who must also work. Innovative programs such as "Weekend College" or "Wednesday College" allows students to concentrate their study over a short period of time without interfering with other responsibilities.

The restrictions on AFDC mothers wishing to re-enter education must be changed. They will not become economically self-sufficient unless they can qualify for more than a minimum wage job and they cannot qualify for more than a minimum wage job unless they can participate in education programs. These guidelines that penalize her for financial aid and attending classes only discourage the woman who is seeking a way out of poverty for her family.

Some of the needs of re-entry women have been included in H.R. 3700, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1964. These include:

- $15 million for schools to provide direct child care services

- opening up eligibility for Pell grants and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants to less than half-time students
- enabling full-time and less than half-time students to include transportation and dependent care costs in calculating their financial need
- waiving home equity calculations for displaced homemakers in determining financial need for educational financial aid

These and other provisions are essential for women re-entering education. We urge the Senate to include strong equity provisions in their bill to reauthorize the Higher Education Act.

As the number of potential "traditional" students decreases, colleges and universities are being forced to look more to the non-traditional student for enrollment. Unless they are willing to develop innovative programs to meet the needs of the non-traditional student in general, and re-entry women in particular, they will not attract these potential students.

Congress can facilitate the re-entry of women into education by providing full funding of existing programs and continuing to include equity provisions in every piece of education and employment legislation. Congress can also ensure equal education opportunity for all Americans by passing the Civil Rights Restoration Act without crippling amendments that do not relate to stamping out discrimination based on race, age, sex or disablity.

You must ensure that all persons seeking to enter or re-enter education and employment programs will be guaranteed an opportunity.

...Behind many successful men and women is a displaced homemaker.

...Behind many institutional doors are educational opportunities.

...Now is the time to open these doors and ensure accessibility as well as availability.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Doctor. We appreciate it.

Ms. Gore, let us turn to you.

Senator KERRY. Mr. Chairman, could I interject one moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Sure.

Senator KERRY. I apologize to the witness. I am due on the floor at 10 o'clock. I just wanted to ask unanimous consent of the committee to have my statement put in the record, if I may.

Could I have the unanimous consent of the committee to put the statement in the record? I apologize. I cannot stay.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY

Senator KERRY. I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, I am glad you are having this hearing because the displaced programs have been very dependent, as we all know, on adult education and vocational/technical training and other kinds of programs. Each of those is substantially offered up for reductions in the President's budget, and I hope that this hearing is going to draw some attention to the critical nature of those cuts and the impact they will have.

And, second, in Massachusetts the WIN Program pilot project opportunity, which was afforded in 1983, has really given us an opportunity to take enormous advantage of an effort to reach out to get people off of welfare, particularly women, obviously, with dependent children.

I hope that the results of this effort will give us a chance to be able to see that funding continue also.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kerry follows:]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERRY

Senator KERRY. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity today to address an issue of overriding importance—women in transition, frequently described as displaced homemakers. There are substantial numbers of these individuals who are divorced, separated or widowed and they are thrust in the workforce out of economic need, many with dependent children. While there is no consensus on how best to address the problem, I believe we all would agree that training and support services are key to helping these individuals make the transition to self-sufficiency. I am confident that today's impressive list of witnesses will provide us with concrete approaches that they have found effective in their own experiences with displaced homemakers.

Although displaced homemakers have long contributed to society, they suddenly find themselves faced with very limited employment opportunities. Dependent on a job market in which their age and sex are liabilities, displaced homemakers face additional barriers because they lack the skills and experience to compete. But their economic need is very real. A recent General Accounting Office report revealed that marital break-up usually results in a dramatic decline in income for women and children—a 43 percent drop for divorced women, 51 percent for separated women, and 30 percent for widows. They have skills that are valuable, but rarely seen as marketable and training skills has become a key to their employment.

In order to help these individuals compete in an increasingly technological workplace, colleges and skills programs have developed innovative approaches to address the educational and training needs. Federal funding has come from several directions: the Job Training Partnership Act; the Vocational Education Act; the Displaced Homemaker Network funding program; and the Work Incentives program (WIN).

Despite the tremendous need, these programs have been under attack during the last five years. Under the Job Training Partnership Act, displaced homemakers must compete with other disadvantaged groups for 10% of the funds available. Re-

duced vocational and adult education programs have limited their own training possibilities and in this year's budget the President proposed a 50% reduction in Vocational Education. And once again, the President proposed the termination of federal funding in WIN, which surprisingly was included in the Senate Budget Committee budget proposal.

WIN is an extremely effective program whose goal is to help welfare recipients attain self-sufficiency. In 1983, when Congress modified the program to allow states to pilot WIN demonstration projects, Massachusetts began implementation of a new Employment and Training (ET Choices) program. To date, the ET Choices program has enjoyed great success by providing targeted categories, of which displaced homemakers are included, with career planning services, job-related skills training and job placement assistance, and supported work opportunities. These support services include child care and transportation in Massachusetts and many other states and deserves to be continued with strong support.

Federal funding for all of these programs remains an essential ingredient to their continuation. In the Commonwealth it is estimated that 150,000 displaced homemakers are in need of services, but current funds allow for the service of only 2500 per year. As seen in may areas of the country, those not served join the ranks of discourage workers after a long and fruitless job search. Those fortunate enough to find employment often settle for jobs with low wages, few benefits and no prospects for retirement protection.

In addition to the funding of employment and training programs, Congress' responsibility extends to insuring adequate equity provisions in federal laws. Two key areas are the passage of the Civil Rights Restoration Act, of which I am a cosponsor, and the need for strong equity provisions in the Higher Education Act to be reauthorized this year. Discrimination presents a significant obstacle to education and employment for midlife women and although these barriers are often subtle they must be addressed.

I look forward to the comments to be made today before this panel and know that we will be better able to identify the needs and prioritize our resources in a joint effort to address the problems of "women in transition."

Senator KENNEDY. My colleague will have an opportunity to address that on the floor this afternoon.

Senator KERRY. I know we will

Senator KENNEDY. So we will be able to put our vote where our speeches are.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say this: It is very important that we put more money in these areas. And I challenge my colleagues, knowing the budgetary difficulties we have, to look for areas where there are ways to conserve. Let us look at programs that are not working as well, and let us rechannel the money into training and education. Because I am willing to do that.

I have been chatting with Ted up here. I really think that the fight that this committee waged to put the displaced homemakers, single heads of household money into the Carl Perkins Act was a good fight. We do not want to lose that.

There are a number of other issues that have now become law, and there are a lot of things that have not become law, like allowing people to work in the home, which is ridiculous to me. To me, it is a tremendous legal barrier to women who want to stay home with their children and work at home but they cannot do so under many circumstances because of our present laws.

There are a lot of things that are barriers today that everybody on this committee could help remove, if we would just lead out in these areas. We are limited as to funding. It is always good to go out there and demagogue on the floor and say we are going to raise this item in the budget when there is not any money to raise it. But there are a lot of programs here that could give up some of their moneys for the benefit of women.

I am going to challenge everybody on this committee to look for that money. Grove City, I will solve that for you in 5 seconds on the Senate floor, and that has been a standing offer ever since the Supreme Court's decision more than a year ago. But, no, it has got to become a great big pseudo-civil rights battle that is merely using women to accomplish things that literally do away with the principle of federalism. And that is an important principle, too, and you have got to balance these things.

Now, help us to know where we can take money that is not being utilized as well. Some would suggest WIN is one of those programs because only a third of the people that come through actually get jobs, compared to Job Corps where 65 percent get jobs, and maybe a number of other programs where placement is higher. But I happen to think WIN has efficacy. But I am just saying, people would question its effectiveness in comparison to other programs for displaced homemakers and single heads of household. And I question it sometimes.

I am saying let us look at it together, let us work on it together. I think members of this committee can in good faith get together on both sides of the table and do some good here. And I challenge us to do it.

I will be watching your amendment this afternoon, too.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Since you mentioned the title IX thing and you said we can work it out in 5 seconds, I would love to work it out.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You and I are going to get together, but it is going to take some leadership because we almost had it done.

Senator SIMON. Well, instead of a 5-second deadline, let us set 1 week.

The CHAIRMAN. I am saying that if your side and I can get together, we are going to do it. There is no question. I am in agreement to extend it institutionwide without question.

But when you start to interject into every aspect of public and private life, that goes far beyond what title IX was pre-Grove City. And that is what the problem has always been. There is no reason why we should not at least go that far and debate the other. If you feel that federalism should go, that is an issue that can be debated. Let us debate that separately.

Senator KERRY. I thank the chairman. I did not mean to interrupt to this degree. I think I have got some commitments that were not expected.

The CHAIRMAN. You got some requests for help.

Senator KERRY. And I am happy to get those. I look forward to voting with you for WIN this afternoon, and I apologize for having to leave at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us hope that we can make WIN a much more effective program like displaced homemakers and single heads of households have been under the Carl Perkins Act.

Ms. Gore.

Ms. GORE. Thank you, Senator Hatch. It is indeed a real pleasure to come before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to have to pull that just a little bit closer to you.

Ms. GORE. Closer? How is that? Is that better?

The CHAIRMAN. That is good.

Ms. GORE. Thank you.

It is indeed a real pleasure for me to come before this Senate committee. This is the committee which, for vocational education, established the set-aside that is in place to effect opportunities for single-parent homemakers and sex equity. These provisions have now been clearly stated. And I thank you on behalf of my colleagues in the other States.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Ms. GORE. I am Charlotte Gore. I am the vocational education equity administrator for the State of Florida. I am the daughter of a displaced homemaker. My mother was widowed when she was 38. She had three teenagers. She did not have any marketable skills so I have grown up in a home which was headed by a single head of household that was striving. And I can certainly attest to the problems that these women are experiencing.

Much of my testimony is based on comments that I have gathered from my colleagues in the other States and also in the District of Columbia.

Women who have principal responsibility for maintaining their own families are generally poor. They are more likely than other families to have only one earner and to have preschool children that restrict labor force activity. They are less likely than other householders to have completed high school and thus less able to meet the increasing skill demands of the modern workplace. Low educational levels are associated with low labor force participation, high unemployment, and low pay. Yet, more than one-half of all these women are employed; however, they are overrepresented in occupations associated with low wages and high unemployment.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, these women have completed fewer years of formal schooling than other women. Nearly 50 percent of the women who are in transition have not graduated from high school and have not worked nor looked for employment outside of the home. Thus, a substantial number of the individuals lack both current work experience and the educational requirements for today's job market. As such they are more likely to be poor.

John Nesbitt, the author of "Megatrends," reports that one can look at today's demographics for Florida and see what the Nation will look like in 1995. One important Florida statistic, which is key in considering self-sufficiency for families that receive financial assistance through Aid to Families with Dependent Children, is two-thirds of the recipients have not completed high school. Ninety-eight percent of the AFDC recipients in Florida are women. When one considers women with a 4-year college degree earn on an average that which is equal to men who have an eighth grade education, these families' futures will always be at or below the poverty level.

Following is a summary of some of the barriers that are limiting the effectiveness of employment and training programs for women who are displaced homemakers.

Women who are in transition are diffcult to reach and to get them to identify themselves. Oftentimes they do not perceive that the program is designed to assist women like themselves. Often they and policymakers think the programs are restricted to low-income females.

There is the lack of recognition among local PIC's that displaced homemakers are indeed individuals who are long-term unemployed.

Some PIC's have recognized training support for displaced homemakers and have assisted with tuition cost but refuse to pay child care. Therefore, the result is the mother is unable to leave her children and thereby does not enter training.

Many States report the only form of public transportation and the most accessible form of public transportation is operated by the public schools. However, many school districts have policies limiting the service to individuals who are in elementary or secondary schools only.

In training: Women are not able to receive the benefit of training and support services under the Job Training Partnership Act to the degree that they are needed. When PIC councils use a competitive bid process, it fosters sweetheart arrangements and is more a reward for grant writing rather than providing the equitable training and services to the population needing assistance.

One of the biggest problems with JTPA is pressure for immediate placement in jobs and high wages. During times when unemployment is high, those who need the help the most are not selected for training programs.

Displaced homemakers who are receiving survivors' benefits under Social Security cannot qualify for training under JTPA. In addition, if a homemaker gets a job, then she will lose her HUD payment.

Several Federal laws have recognized that single parents and/or homemakers need financial assistance to access employment training programs. Among them is the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act with a set-aside of 8.5 of the State basic grant. Local vocational educators in Florida have been very excited with the potential impact of these provisions. During this first year of implementation, this has meant a change from 11 programs assisting women in transition to over 125 programs. This is approximately 60 percent of all the eligible recipients in Florida participating in developing training programs, activities, and services. However, we are encountering some of the same problems that many of the other States are facing. If we indeed give priority in serving those individuals of greatest financial need—which is one of the requirements—probably those who are on public assistance would meet that criteria, such as providing child care, transportation, and tuition. We find not only is their public assistance grant reduced proportionately but also affected is the medical assistance they are able to receive. As you are undoubtedly aware, few educational programs provide medical insurance or medical assistance to the students.

Another problem area associated with the Carl Perkins Act is the assurance vocational education services and assistance provided to individuals shall, to the extent practicable, include worksite pro-

grams such as cooperative vocational education, work-study, and apprenticeship. We agree these are excellent methods for displaced homemakers to gain marketable skills, receive actual work experience in the industry that they are being trained in, while also being compensated. However, oftentime the total public assistance grant is canceled as a result of the single parent with dependent children who is motivated to become self-sufficient and is trying to put herself in a position where she can earn a living wage.

Most of the sex equity coordinators had major concerns regarding funding. It is their assessment that there just are not enough funds being provided to provide vocational training that is needed by the single parents and homemakers.

One of the provisions of the Carl Perkins Act is that personnel appointed to work full-time to assist the State board shall administer the vocational education programs for sex equity and single parents and homemakers. In some States where this is being done, we have been able to see results in serving this targeted population, such as in my State. In some States it is not clear that this full-time person has been given the administrative authority of the funds identified in the act.

Our recommendations: First, the displaced homemakers who are on public assistance need a transition time between training-employment and the stopping of their support grant. Most training programs train for entry level positions. Many of these women do seek occupations that are traditional for women; therefore, the wages oftentime are low. Some single parents have grants greater than the wages they are able to earn upon entering the work force. Therefore, it becomes a disincentive for them to be trained where they receive less money.

The second recommendation: The definition of dislocated worker contained in the JTPA Act should be clear that displaced homemakers qualify for programs and services under the act. Displaced homemakers should be able to be qualified through all three elements of eligibility and not be limited to only the long-term unemployed.

Third. Individuals who are receiving public assistance and are in vocational training should not have their support grant affected. Presently, this is provided for participants in training who are assisted through vocational rehabilitation. There is a 3-year waiver contained in the Social Security Act for this unique population. A similar waiver should be granted to displaced homemakers on public assistance who are in an employment or vocational training program.

Fourth. Funds that support training of targeted population should be by formula and evaluated according to a plan developed to meet the employment training needs of the population.

Fifth. Partnerships between industry and education to train displaced homemakers should be promoted. Tax incentives should be provided to employers who employ displaced homemakers that were trained by their company through a work-study arrangement.

Sixth. Congress should monitor the States to ensure requirements set forth to assist special populations are being implemented as provided by the respective laws.

Seventh. Funds to assist employment training should be awarded at full funding under the Carl Perkins Act. Funds authorized by title III, part C, are needed to assist the displaced homemakers in training or retraining; and

Eighth. Adults in training should be permitted to be transported on public school buses upon space being available.

I have provided for you also three models that you may want to consider.

One other comment I would like to make in response to Senator Kerry. I just recently reviewed a draft of a bill that may come before the Florida Legislature this session where 50 percent of 80 percent of the Carl Perkins Act and a substantial part of the JTPA dollars were trying to be earmarked to assist AFDC recipients as a part of the work fare bill to take two programs assisted by Federal dollars which are working in support of this population, and then trying to fund another program that seemingly may not be working as effectively. This really is going to water down the effectiveness of these other employment training programs. So, I would suggest that this be watched carefully in all States.

Currently, we feel as though this is not going to come forward, that it has been deleted from the bill, but I do caution the committee to watch carefully as we move into work fare.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Gore follows:]

Statement of

Charlotte Carney Gore

Vocational Education Equity Administrator

Division of Vocational, Adult and Community Education

Florida Department of Education

before the

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

April 30, 1986

I am Charlotte Carney Gore, Vocational Education Equity Administrator, Division of Vocational, Adult and Community Education, Florida Department of Education. I am the daughter of a displaced homemaker. My mother was widowed at the age of 38. She had three teenage children and no marketable skills. During the last six years I have served as a member on the Board of Directors of the Displaced Homemakers Network. Today I speak to you as a representative of this country's 5.6 million women in transition and the more than 2,000 employment and training programs which serve them. Much of my testimony is based upon comments I have gathered from other sex equity coordinators across the nation and the District of Columbia.

Women who have been caring for their homes and families and who must enter or re-enter the workforce due to divorce, death, or disablement of their spouse are the women in transition. They have diminished marketable skills as a results of having cared for their home and family. On the average they are mature women. More than 80 percent are 40 years of age or more and 50 percent are 55 years and over. After many years of work in the home, they are suddenly faced with the necessity of making a living in the paid labor market.

Among the most striking changes that occured during the 1970's was the sharp rise in the number of women who had the principal responsibility for the maintenance and welfare of their own families. The number of these families rose from 5.6 million in 1970 to almost 10 million in 1985, up over 70 percent, 5.9 million had children under 18 years. The overall rise of women maintaining families-more than 3.8 million-was greater than that posted during the preceding two decades. These women are divorced (37 percent), and widowed (26

percent), followed by women separated from their husbands (20 percent), and those who have never been married (17 percent).

Women who have principal responsibility for maintaining their own families are generally poor. They are more likely than other families to have only one earner, and to have preschool children that restrict labor force activity. They are less likely than other householders to have completed high school, and thus less able to meet the increasing skill demands of the modern workplace. Low educational levels are associated with low labor force participation, high unemployment, and low pay. Yet, more than one-half of all these women are employed; however, they are overrepresented in occupations associated with lower wages and higher unemployment rates.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics these women have completed fewer years of formal schooling than other women. Nearly 50 percent of the women who are in transition have not graduated from high school and have not worked nor looked for employment outside of the home. Thus, a substantial number of the individuals lack both current work experience and the educational requirements for today's job market. As such they are more likely to be poor.

Although more likely to work, the women with children under 18 had a considerably lower family income than women with no children at home. Nearly 45 percent of the female one-parent families with chilren under 18 years old had incomes below the poverty level in 1981. A large proportion-45 percent-of these one-parent families with children were maintained by black women; their families included about 48 percent of all children living in poor families maintained by women. Where there were no children under 18 in families maintained by all women, about 13 percent of the total, but 24 percent of the

black female householder families, lived below the poverty level.

John Nesbitt, author of Megatrends, reports that one can look at today's demographics for Florida and see what the nation will look like in 1995. One important Florida statistic which is key in considering self sufficiency for families that receive financial assistance through Aid to Families with Dependent Children is two-thirds of the recipients have not completed high school. Ninety-eight percent of the AFDC recipients in Florida are women. When one considers women with a four year college degree earn on an average that which is equal to men who have an eighth grade education these families future will always be at or below poverty.

Following is a summary of some of the barriers that are limiting the effectiveness of employment and training programs for women who are in displaced homemakers.

ACCESS:

Women who are in transition are difficult to reach and to get them to identify themselves. Often times they do not perceive that the program is designed to assist women like themselves. Often they and policy makers think the programs are restricted to low income female.

There is the lack of recognition among local PIC'S that displaced homemakers are indeed individuals who are long term unemployed.

Some PIC's have recognized training support for displaced homemakers and have assisted with tuition cost but refuse to pay childcare. Therefore the result is the mother is unable to leave her children and thereby does not enter training.

Many states report the only form of public transportation and most accessible form of public transportation is operated by the public schools. However, many school districts have policies limiting the service to individuals who are in elementary or secondary education.

TRAINING:

Women are not able to receive the benefit of the training and support services under the Job Training Partnership Act to the degree that they are needed. When PIC Councils use a competitive bid process it fosters "sweetheart arrangements" and is more a reward for grant writing rather than providing the equitable training and services to the population needing assistance.

One of the biggest problems with JTPA is pressure for immediate placement in jobs and high wages. During times when unemployment is high those who need the help the most are not selected for training programs.

Displaced Homemakers who are receiving surviors benefits under social security can not qualify for training under JTPA. In addition, if a homemaker gets a job, then she will lose her HUD payment.

Several federal laws have recognized that single parents and /or homemakers need financial assistance to access employment training programs. Among them is the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act with a set aside of 8.5% of the State Basic grant. Local Vocational Educators in Florida have been very excited with the potential impact of these provisions. During this first year of implementation this has meant a change of from 11 programs assisting women in transition to over 125. This is approximately sixty percent of all eligible

63-226 O - 86 - 2

recipients in Florida participating in developing training programs, activities and support services for this target population. However, we are encountering some of the same problems that many of the other states are facing. If we indeed give priority in serving those individuals of greatest financial need, probably those on public assistance grants, such as providing childcare, transportation, tuition, we find not only is their public assistance grant is reduced proportionately but also affected is the medical assistance they are able to receive. As you are undoubtedly aware few educational programs provide medical insurance or assistance to the students.

Another problem area associated with the Carl Perkins Act is the assurance vocational education services and assistance provided to individuals shall, to the extent practicable, include work-site programs such as cooperative vocational education, work-study, and apprenticeship. We agree these are excellent methods for displaced homemakers to gain marketable skills, receive actual work experience in the industry that they are being trained in while also being compensated. However, often times the total public assistance grant is cancelled as a results of the single parent with dependent children who is motivated to become self sufficient is trying to put herself in a position where she can earn a living wage.

Most of the sex equity coordinators had major concerns regarding funding. It is their assessment that there just are not enough funds being provided to provide the vocational training that is needed by single parents and homemakers.

One of the provisions of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act is that the personnel appointed to work full time to assist the state board shall administer vocational education programs for sex

equity and single parents and homemakers. In states where this is being done we have been able to see results in serving the targeted population, such as in Florida. In some states it is not clear that this full-time person has been given the administrative authority of the funds identified by the Act.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.) The displaced homemakers who are on public assistance need a transition time between training-employment and the stopping of their support grant. Most training programs train for entry level positions. Many of these women do seek occupations that are traditional for women, therefore the wages often are low. Some single parents have grants greater than the wages they are able to earn upon entering the workforce. Therefore it becomes a disincentive for them to be trained where they will receive less money.

2.) The definition of dislocated worker contained in the JTPA Act should be clear that displaced homemakers qualify for programs and services under the Act. Only three states have made this determination.

Displaced homemaker should be able to be qualified all three elements of eligibility and not by long term unemployment only.

3.) Individuals who are receiving public assistance and are in vocational training should not have their support grant affected. Presently this is provided for participants in training who are assisted through vocational rehabilitation. There is a three year waiver contained in the Social Secuity Act for this unique population. A similiar waiver should be granted to displaced homemakers on public assistance who are in an employment or vocational

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

education training program.

4.) Funds that support training of targeted population should be by formula and evaluated according to a plan developed to meet the employment training needs of the population.

5.) Partnerships between industry and education to train displaced homemakers should be promoted. Tax incentives should be provided to employers who employ displaced homemakers that were trained by their company through a work study arrangement.

6.) Congress should monitor the states to insure requirements set forth to assist special populations are being implemented as provided by the respective laws.

7.) Funds to assist employment training should be awarded at full funding under the Carl Perkins Act. Funds authorized by Title III, Part C are needed to assist displaced homemakers in training or retraining.

8.) Adults in training should be permitted to be transported on public school busses upon space being available.

EXAMPLES OF MODEL PROGRAMS:

COLORADO SPRINGS RESOURCE AGENCY, Tri-way agreement between Chamber of Commerce, Women's Resource Center, Pikes Peak Community College. As Chamber of Commerce is working with a business coming into area they inquire with the new business how many women in special population will they be employing. The referral is made to the Resource Center, they link with the college who provides information to individuals who have been or are being trained in needed occupations.

PARENT/CHILD CENTER in Middlebury Vt.(Community Based

Organization)-Single Parent and Homemakers are prepared for employment through on-the-job training. They are given a stipend while interning on the job. It is excellent - they do not lose welfare benefits. Child care and transportation are provided.

MODEL SEX EQUITY PROGRAM, Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Florida. Displaced Homemakers are prepared for employment through short term non traditional training program. There is major involvement of local large and small businesses working with vocational training in designing curriculum and assisting with instruction. Over eighty percent of completers are placed in occupations for which they were trained. Most have employment before the training ends.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. I believe the recommendations in my testimony are needed, and would make a difference to women in transition in assisting them to gain self sufficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. This testimony has been terrific so far. You have given us a lot of ideas. Some of them we have in bill form right now.

Ms. GORE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Like the tax incentives, which we have had some difficulty in moving. So, we are appreciative to have this testimony.

Dr. Bryant, let us turn to you.

Senator KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, may I just take a minute of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. Sure.

Senator KENNEDY. We were talking about the WIN Program and the Job Corps Program earlier. In our State of Massachusetts of those that are placed, 90 percent are women participating in the WIN Program. There is a very important and direct correlation in terms of mobility of women. This is an extraordinary statistic, and we have in our Massachusetts program, thousands of women who are waiting to participate in those programs. And those figures of 90 percent are also reflected in the numbers that want to participate in the program. They want to work, they want to get the skills, and they need the kinds of support systems which you have outlined here.

I appreciate your comments. I apologize to Dr. Bryant.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just add to this. My judgment on WIN is kind of being decided now. Because I agree; that is what it is designed to do, to help women. But only about a third are being placed.

Now, I am not sure whether that is because of barriers or other problems, but my feeling is it is because of the convoluted nature of the administration of the program. Like most Federal programs, we wind up taking good care of the administrators and not such good care of the people.

That is why I like the Carl Perkins Act. Of course, we designed it right here in this committee.

Ms. GORE. Yes; you did.

The CHAIRMAN. And we turned that over to the sex equity coordinators who I think are dedicated people who really want to do what is right for women.

Now, it works better in some States than it does in others. Your State happens to be one where, under your leadership and others, it seems to be working. But I am concerned about WIN because I see those problems. I would like to have some help from you on that. If WIN is a great program, I want to know it. I want to know why it is because I see a lot of reasons that say it is not a great program compared to some that are.

Why are we not pouring our moneys into those that really work? I get so tired of having Job Corps attacked. These are young hardcore unemployed young men and women who would not have a chance otherwise.

We have got a 65-percent placement rate. So what if it does cost $12,000 per unit? That is a small price to pay compared to the million we would pay for each person on welfare the rest of his or her life. And I think it is time we wake up on some of these things. That is a pretty good placement rate. And in some areas it is 95 percent placement where we have really good Job Corps centers.

Now, see, I would like to see these programs work in that order, and I would like to see us quit proliferating money everywhere and make sure that it works well.

I can remember when Carl Perkins came up. We sat right in this very room with the House committee. First of all, they wanted to cut it out. Then they wanted to fractionate every dollar among every feminist group in the country so it would have been ineffective. We limited it to these two groups and insisted on it because these are the two, it seems to me, most prevalent groups of women in poverty. We just had to fight for it.

Now, I get a little tired of that. I hope women will help us on this committee to know what to do with the limited funds that we have. I would like to see those funds go for much greater purposes than all this throwing money at programs without looking at the peripheral or the long-range implications and effects of those programs.

Your testimony thus far today has been just excellent. It is really helping us with issues and programs that this committee has had a lot to do with.

So let us turn to you, Dr. Bryant. We look forward to hearing what you have to say as well.

Dr. BRYANT. Thank you.

My name is Anne Bryant, and I am the executive director of the American Association of University Women.

AAUW is an organization of 175,000 college-educated women, and with over 2,000 local branches nationwide, we really are in every community in the county.

AAUW was founded in 1881 on principles on securing and promoting educational opportunity for women. The Education Foundation, founded in 1958, provides over $1 million annually to women for education, research and self-development.

The term reentry women students means a woman who has left her schooling for a time, perhaps to raise a family or maybe, like many of your wives, to help her husband's political career and now seeks to reenter school to complete her college degree or certificate.

I have some good news to share with you today about the emerging phenomenon of these women in education. It is good news for higher education institutions, for American society, and for the economy.

Women reentering education are achievers. They are motivated. They are committed. They are dedicated and they are bright. Even when attending school part time and attending to family and work duties at the same time, reentry women outperform their younger counterparts by earning higher grade point averages and the completion rate is greater.

In short, reentry students are not simply acceptable students; I think at times they are the best.

Moreover, reentry women are the fastest growing and largest segment of adult learners in higher education. The population of reentry women in education provides us with the best capital investment our country can make, now and in the future.

Given our country's increased need for an educated America, our increased need to expand our ability to compete in scientific and the technological marketplaces, and given the terrible tragedy that

has happened in Kiev, we know we need educated, technically trained people. We need to build our Nation's security. We need to retain the intellectual and aesthetic vigor of our Nation's cultural life.

It would be a tragedy to deny full opportunity and encouragement to this group.

There is also bad news because there are barriers, as you have mentioned. And I would like to share with you three scenarios.

Meet Sara. In 1977, Sara was working on a college degree when she left school to marry Jim. She worked to put him through law school and is now 36 and a mother of two. And like many middle income families in America, they have recognized that one income is not sufficient. She must finish her B.A.

Due to her family responsibilities, which she wants to take part in, she must enroll part time. As a part-time student taking less than six credits, Sara would not be eligible to receive Federal student aid. She is not alone.

Meet our second reentry candidate, Mary, a recently divorced mother of three who plans to enroll in a hotel management program at the college in her home town. She now earns $9,800 a year; that is $4.50 an hour. She is in a clerical job. She needs a college degree so that she can improve her job and salary and, hence, make adequate support for her family even possible.

Mary has two young children. She faces the barrier of finding affordable and available child care services, an all too familiar obstacle.

In addition, Mary's child care costs may not be calculated in determining her student aid grant.

Finally, meet Jane, an Aid to Families with Dependent Children recipient who is the mother of two and head of her household. She would like to go to college to increase her chances of being able to support her family. But if Jane receives student financial aid, it may be counted as income, making her ineligible for continued subsistence income, medical and nutritional assistance.

In short, she faces a stark choice. She can go to school and thereby increase her chances for economic self-sufficiency, or she can feed her children.

To date, the attempts of educational institutions and the Federal Government to respond affirmatively and effectively to the plight of reentry women have been inadequate. We knew far too little about these women. We must know more about them, about their oncampus and their offcampus needs.

We do know a few things. We know that most reentry women report they return to school because of economic necessity, which your graphs have shown us.

We know that while some reentry women are wealthy, the vast majority are not. Even with the help of husband and family, reentry women students need Federal student aid as much, if not more, than their younger counterparts.

Further, we know that women in general increasingly are more dependent upon public and private funds to assist with their college expenses. For example, our foundation, the AAUW's Education Foundation, received over 1,300 applications for 85 American

postgraduate fellowships. We received 765 applications for 34 of our international postgraduate fellowships.

Despite these facts, research on women and student assistance, as documented in our policy brief which was completed earlier this year and is part of the written testimony, demonstrates how present Federal policies disproportionately limit a woman's opportunity to equal student aid.

Federal and institutional policies and practices discriminate against women because these policies were designed to fit the needs of the "traditional," younger, single, full-time student.

Women students are more likely to be nontraditional—older, have family and work responsibilities. AAUW is well aware that the Federal Government cannot take complete responsibility for the plight of reentry women. We know that the funds are not unlimited.

Educational institutions must do their part, and our written testimony provides facts and statistics and recommendations for those institutions. There are, however, remedies Congress can seek. I applaud your discussions earlier about what you are willing to do on the overturn of the 1984 *Grove City* Supreme Court decision. And whether it is 5 seconds or 1 week, I know you are going to come to a solution.

Title IX is the only Federal law that protects women in education and was instrumental in securing opportunities for older reentry women. That is the result of title IX.

Congress also has before it this year the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. AAUW has developed a series of recommendations that address many of the aforementioned problems facing reentry and nontraditional students. We do stand ready to assist you in ensuring that the Senate HEA address the needs of women students presented here today.

Specifically we recommend that the HEA reauthorization include funding for additional research and data on students. The materials prepared for this hearing, I am sure, came from some of the organizations which need this funding. Research give us facts and facts lead to action.

Second, we recommend amending the student aid policy to assure that child care costs are accurately reflected in a student's budget. My colleagues' testimony, I know, agrees with me on that.

Third, we recommend amending student aid policy to open eligibility to Federal aid programs to less than half-time students: The woman who wants to stay at home and take care of her children and therefore takes less than 6 credit hours.

Fourth, we recommend that individuals who receive AFDC be eligible for student financial assistance without the threat that that very subsistence income is taken away. Federal student aid, which translates into educational access for our entire population, is a concept that has made this country great. Out of this concept have come creative, educated and motivated individuals, people who build a strong economy. They have made us the fierce competitors in this world marketplace that we are today

But the problems that I have outlined today will be our economic undoing if we are not addressing them. Careful analysis of demographic trends and labor market needs point to the fact that we

cannot neglect this huge resource of talent among reentry women. She is the best capital investment that our country can make, now and in the future.

Thank you very much for the time to address you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Bryant follows:]

American Association of University Women

2401 Virginia Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20037
(202) 785-7700

The Re-Entry of Women Into Higher Education

Testimony Submitted to the

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

April 30, 1986

by

Dr. Anne L. Bryant
Executive Director

American Association of University Women
2401 Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

(202) 785-7112

Many demographic changes are taking place in American society that affect the lives of women, the population of colleges and universities and the composition of the labor force. Millions of women are re-entering higher education -- after having left the education system for a variety of reasons -- and are entering the job market upon completion of their degrees and certificates. This emergence of "re-entry women" as a distinct population in our society is a phenomenon that deserves, and indeed demands attention from the higher education establishment and from government as well.

It is time to focus attention on who these re-entry women are, why they left school initially, why they are returning, and most importantly, what barriers prevent their full pursuit of education and employment opportunity. The material that follows highlights many of the important trends involved in this issue, and presents a picture of re-entry women -- a picture that will become increasingly significant as the enrollment of "traditional age" students (18 to 22 years old) continues to decline.

Exactly what is a re-entry woman student? She is defined as "any woman who has interrupted her education after high school for at least a few years, and is now re-entering or seeking to re-enter a college or university for the purpose of completing a degree or certificate."[1] This woman may never have attended college; she may have left school before completion of a degree or she may be starting a new undergraduate or graduate program.[2]

PROFILE OF THE RE-ENTRY WOMAN STUDENT

As the largest group of current and projected re-entry students, adult women are diversified by background, age, race, economic and social status and educational, career and life goals.[3] A survey of re-entry women done by the Program for Re-Entry Women, a model program at the University of Maryland, College Park Campus, produced the following stereotypical composite of the re-entry woman: She is a settled family woman. She is 31, married and has children. She has 60 semester hours of college credits before most recently returning to school. She has been away from school for six years. She is taking fewer credits than traditional students. Her husband is well-educated, with one-fifth at the doctorate or professional level.[4]

Of course, as a group re-entry women vary tremendously in all of the characteristics noted above and in other areas as well. For example:

- Though most of these women are at least over twenty-five years of age, significant sectors of this population vary in age from their late twenties to their sixties.[5]

- Enrollment of people of color still lags behind that of white Americans, and, unfortunately, there is little data available on re-entry women of color. The re-entry trend does exist in the minority communities, and women of color comprise

an important segment of this re-entry population. Though little data exists in this area, some very general information suggests that this is the case. For example, in 1978 10% of full-time undergraduates were Black, and 57% of these students were women. Meanwhile, women of Hispanic and Native American origin comprised 52% of their groups' total population in full-time undergraduate programs.[6]

- The economic and social backgrounds of re-entry women as well as their aims in seeking further education also differ tremendbusly. As a group these women span the spectrum from economically disadvantaged to upper middle class; from those with no postsecondary school training who are seeking basic vocational skills to those who hold a college degree, but who are seeking doctorates or other advanced degrees to improve their career prospects. Some of this economic diversity is reflected in the fact that 67% of all women 35 and over who were enrolled in school in 1978 were also in the labor force.[7] In most cases, this dual role as worker and student is a simple case of economic necessity.

The reasons why re-entry women left school in the first place and the reasons why they are returning are as varied as the economic and social backgrounds of these women. They may have left school due to marriage, child rearing, entry into the labor force, economic difficulties, health problems or geographic relocation. In fact, many re-entry women left school initially because of a combination of these reasons.[8] Moreover, many of these initial responsibilities continue for these women after they return to school, which accounts for the fact that they often have a great many more responsibilities than the average traditional student.[9] In turn, women are returning to school in reaction to a series of complex forces that both pressure them and pull them back into the education system. For example, economic conditions are forcing some women into school and work while personal ambitions and goals are prompting other women to develop new skills and seek new experiences through participation in school and work. An understanding of these forces and the needs they are creating in women is crucial if institutions are to compete vigorously for these students, and develop programs and structures that effectively meet the needs of re-entry women.

Economic and social factors converge to create the major catalysts for women to re-enter higher education. The changing face of the American labor force and the American family tells the story of economic necessity and the new social reality:

- Throughout the 1970s women joined the labor force at an average rate of over 1 million annually.[10]

- 52% of all women aged 16 and over are in the labor force.[11]

- 90% of all women will be employed outside the home at some time during their lives.[12]

- The average woman, whether single or married, can expect to work for 34 years.[13]

- Almost two-thirds of all working women are single, widowed, divorced or separated, or have husbands who earn under $10,000.[13]

- The majority of single-headed houses are maintained by women and the majority of these women maintain a family.[15]

- The fastest growing segment of the labor force during the 1970s were married women with husbands present and mothers with school-age children.[16]

- By 1990, three out of every four wives will be working outside the home.[17]

- By 1990, two-thirds of all mothers with children under 6 years of age will be in the work force and

three-fourths of two-parent families will have both parents at work.[18]

These statistics only tell part of the story. Most re-entry women return to school and enter the labor force because of economic necessity. Virtually all of these women work to support their families and maintain their standards of living.[19] Moreover, these women realize that, in the words of one study, "a college education can mean the difference between getting a good job, just getting by, and being poor."[20]

WHY WOMEN RETURN TO SCHOOL: THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND PERSONAL FACTORS

The correlation between a good education and a good job has not gone unnoticed by women, in part because the evidence of this connection is obvious and startling. During the 1970s, women with 4 years of college had earnings 25% higher than women with high school diplomas, and a woman college graduate earns over $200,000 more over her lifetime than a woman with only a high school education.[21] Labor Department data also indicates that college-educated women are found more frequently in the higher salaried professional and technical occupations than in the low-wage positions in which most women are employed.[22] There is also evidence which indicates that the more education a woman has the more likely she is to be employed,[23] and that the discrepancy between female and male earning power does decrease as educational levels of women increase.[24] Finally, full-time women workers earn on the average 64% of what men earn, due to wage

discrimination and job segregation.[25] As a result women must often acquire more advanced educational credentials simply to earn equal and adequate wages as compared to men.

In the social and personal spheres, the factors that lead women back to school are often more subtle than the economic conditions noted above, yet they are equally compelling and they deserve the recognition, attention and support of institutions and government. Today, for example, many women live longer and healthier lives than ever before, and the difference between their life expectancy and that of their husbands is growing.[26] As a result, women face the increasing likelihood that they will live part of their lives by themselves. Mothers are also having children earlier than ever before, and these children are leading more independent lives and leaving home earlier. As a result of these trends, many women now find themselves with a great deal of "unplanned time" during which family obligations lessen and more time is available for personal opportunities and advancements such as completion of a previously interrupted education.[27] Finally, as women begin to view themselves in light of their roles in the 1980's and beyond, the desire for personal fulfillment, new identities and new directions has grown tremendously.[28] These trends are occurring at a time when there is growing acceptance, popularity and indeed demand for continuing education, liberal learning and "education for those who would be free."[29]

THE BENEFITS OF RE-ENTRY: FOR INDIVIDUALS, INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIETY

Whatever reasons lead to the choices millions of re-entry women are making, it is clear that the benefits waiting for them are indeed great. Still, the story of re-entry women cannot be fully told unless it is placed in the context of the many benefits colleges, universities and the society at large will gain by the participation of these women in higher education and in the labor force. As college and university administrators are well aware, the pool of traditional students (18 to 22 years old) has been diminishing for several years and it will continue to do so for decades to come.[30] For example, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education predicts that by 1997 there will be a 23% decline in the traditional college-bound group of 18-24 year olds.[31]

The positive impact of re-entry women for college and university enrollments has already materialized.[32] The number of women in college over 35 years of age doubled from 1972 to 1978, and these women accounted for 65% of all of the college students over age 35.[33] The existence of this group of re-entry women is the major reason why women now outnumber men in college for the first time since World War II.[34] Enrollment of women, especially re-entry women, has grown not only for full-time programs, but also for part-time programs, and, in large measure, re-entry women account for the tremendous increase in popularity of part-time programs.[35] The Carnegie Council and other groups have predicted that most if not all of these trends will continue to the year 2000.[36]

The benefits re-entry women bring to colleges and universities go beyond salvaging the enrollment lists and thus maintaining the existence and health of many of these institutions, and also include tremendous contributions to the entire academic life of colleges and universities. As seasoned veterans in the classroom of life, these women have developed interests, perspectives, skills and motivations that younger students often lack. As a result, the diversity, energy and productivity these women bring to campuses has proven to be invigorating to the institutions' intellectual and social environment. Even when attending school only on a part-time basis, often out of necessity, re-entry women usually outperform their younger counterparts by earning higher grade point averages and having higher completion rates for courses.[37] In short, re-entry students are not simply acceptable students; many times they are the best students.

The benefits reaped by society through the re-entry of women into higher education are as great as those for the educational institutions themselves. The continuing advanced education of all segments of our populace is not only a positive societal good in itself, but is beneficial in terms of increased economic productivity and tax revenues and greater availability of needed professional, semi-professional and skilled workers. Education for those who would be productive, equal and free has clear and undeniable benefits for the entire society.

-10-

BARRIERS TO RE-ENTRY AND THEIR REMEDIES

Despite these numerous advantages re-entry women bring to themselves, the institutions they attend and society as a whole, women's efforts to re-enter education have not been easy ones. The efforts of colleges, universities and the government to respond affirmatively and effectively to this trend have been woefully inadequate -- to the extent that such efforts have existed at all. Re-entry women continue to face a variety of barriers that can only be removed with a concerted effort on the part of colleges, universities and government. Although each institution must look at its particular re-entry population to determine the barriers these students face, there are some problems that seem almost universal for re-entry women in America today.[38] These barriers and their potential resolution include:

The Need for Data Collection. Institutions of higher education and government cannot begin to address the barriers faced by re-entry women nor reap the benefits offered by these women without knowing more about them. Current, comprehensive and accurate information on who re-entry women are, what needs and goals they have and other relevant issues is desperately needed. Institutions and government should undertake a comprehensive effort to collect data on current and potential re-entry women, so that the specific barriers detailed below can be addressed in a rational, reasonable and informed fashion. Needless to say, all information on re-entry students should be broken down according to gender, race, class, disability and other characteristics in order to understand the circumstances of all the women who comprise the re-entry pool.

The Need for Financial Aid. As a group, re-entry women need financial aid as much, if not more, than the general student population. Many women who could successfully enter or re-enter postsecondary education do not do so because they do not have the financial resources and/or because they do not believe that they are eligible for student financial assistance.[39] Though some re-entry students may be wealthy, the vast majority are not, and the price tag for education is astronomically high. In 1984-85, the average yearly cost of tuition, room and board for undergraduate students was over $3,000 at public colleges and over $7,500 at private colleges.[40] A variety of factors make women less able to pay these prices and less able to receive aid to cover the costs.

More women than men students come from low-income families.[41] There is also evidence that freshmen women are twice as likely as freshmen men to be self-supporting, and indeed a substantial majority of re-entry women (66%) are actually self-supporting.[42] Moreover, women are much more likely than men to bear child and other dependent care expenses and responsibilities. The over 6.2 million families headed by women in 1984 -- double the number in 1970 -- accounted for one-fifth of all families with children that year, up from one-tenth in 1970.[43] Student costs are so high that student aid has become as essential for middle-income students as it always has been for low-income students. This explains why 51% of today's college students rely, at least in part, on some form of financial aid, and even larger percentages planning to attend school report a need for such aid.[44] It is also important to note in this

context that more women than men report that financial aid is crucial in making choices about college.[45]

Unfortunately, instead of realizing this acute need for aid on the part of women students, especially re-entry women students, colleges and universities as well as the federal government continue to implement financial aid policies that do not give women a fair share of the financial aid pie. Re-entry women often receive less aid because aid programs have been designed with the traditional student in mind.[46] As a result, these re-entry women students often have less of their "real" college costs met by student aid. For example, women students' awards are often smaller than those of men. Among self-supporting students at public colleges in 1981-82, women students received smaller grants than men students and had a smaller proportion of their college costs covered by grants.[47] Women also receive less aid through loans than men at both private and public colleges.[48] Also, low-income women are less likely than low-income men to receive Guaranteed Student Loans.[49] Finally, women are more likely than men to be part-time students, who are excluded totally from receiving certain types of aid and who are sometimes charged higher rates of tuition and minimum per-semester fees.[50]

A wide range of possible actions exist that colleges and government can take in order to begin to address these inequities and barriers for re-entry women.[51] Institutions and government should review all student financial aid policies in order to assess the needs of re-entry women and institute programs

specifically designed to cope with their financial aid problems. One important part of any program includes direct outreach to adult women learners about their eligibility for aid. Other program options include: special training of campus financial aid and government aid personnel; simplification of intimidating aid red tape; flexible financing policies that include tuition deferrals and a variety of loan repayment options; reduced tuition and other cost breaks; provision of aid for part-time students as well as adequate emergency aid assistance for such students; development of expense budgets that reflect the costs of re-entry women; reform of federal and state assistance laws to enable low-income women to attend school; and cultivation of private and other funding sources for financial aid for women in general and re-entry women in particular.[52]

The Need for Dependent Care. The financial aid barriers cited above are intimately related to another major barrier for re-entry women, namely the lack of adequate child care and other forms of dependent care and the lack of resources to pay for such care. Women are more likely than men to bear child care and other dependent care expenses and responsibilities.[53] Older women students report that child care is vital to both their education and their employment.[54] In a 1976 survey, two-thirds of the women students at an urban university who had re-entered college reported that they had children at home, and a different study done at the University of Michigan in the late 1970's reported that one-fifth of its women students would seek more education or employment if child care were available.[55] The

situation is even more desperate for low-income women who have the most difficulty meeting child care costs.[56]

As with financial aid, these dependent care needs of re-entry and other women students are not only ignored but exacerbated by current policies. Current federal student aid regulations allow campus student aid officers to ignore child care costs in calculating student need.[57] Moreover, most campuses do not have any day care centers, preschools or nursery schools, and those that do must often rely on nonuniversity funds for the bulk of their operating budget.[58] Even when programs exist and federal policies do not interfere with the availability of child care for re-entry women, re-entry womens' part-time status often makes them ineligible for the aid to pay for the care, or access to the care itself.[59]

There are a variety of options that colleges, universities and the government can jointly explore in order to identify and reconcile the specific concerns of re-entry women as well as other women and men who need dependent care services in order to continue their education.[60] Before designing any type of program, institutions should, of course, conduct an extensive review to determine the specific needs of the student population. It is generally important to offer a variety of dependent care options and ensure secure and adequate funding for all of the options implemented.[61] It is also crucial that available services be publicized in ways likely to reach the nontraditional student population that is most in need of the service.[62] And, most importantly, it is essential that

institutional policies as well as federal and state policies stop creating barriers in the area of dependent care and begin to support and meet the needs for such services, especially for re-entry women.

There are many other barriers and problems that re-entry students face in their efforts to pursue their educational and employment objectives. The following is only a brief listing and description of these areas:

Problems related to being a part-time student. Many of the difficulties re-entry women face, such as exclusion from financial aid, support services, internship programs, and so on, stem from their status as part-time students because, as such, they often are not viewed as being "serious" or "committed." This is a false assumption based on a "traditional student" perspective that is no longer applicable in light of the changing nature of the student population and data indicating the performance level of part-time students. Policies and programs must begin to address the needs and concerns of part-time students.[63]

Need for support services. Most younger students take support services, such as medical insurance and campus housing, for granted. However, many re-entry women students may not qualify for these and other services because of age, family status or part-time status. Also, in some instances, available services are geared for younger students and are inappropriate for re-entry women.[64]

Lack of adequate counseling. The academic, career and personal goals of older students are often very different from those of younger students; therefore counseling for re-entry women in these areas needs to be different as well. Also, re-entry women students may need additional encouragement during the first part of their re-entry career in order for their continued participation in programs to be guaranteed.[65] Counseling programs should take this fact into account.

Need for services geared to special groups. Within the re-entry population there are many diverse groups such as people of color, persons with disabilities, the elderly, displaced homemakers, single parents, parents with dependent care responsibilities, and low-income women. Re-entry programs need to take the needs and concerns of these women into account if they are to adequately respond to the entire re-entry phenomenon.[66]

Lack of recruitment efforts aimed at re-entry women and problems with admissions. Returning women students are not actively recruited on many campuses, especially in "hard sciences," at the graduate level, or in other areas considered "nontraditional" for women. Part of this is due to the erroneous and unacceptable belief on the part of some people that women, particularly women with children, do not belong in the academic community. In addition, the admission process often works against older women by negatively factoring in their work or education history. This puts applicants with childbearing and family responsibilities at a distinct disadvantage.[67] Instead of

viewing these aspects of a re-entry woman's application as "gaps" in the acceptable education/work cycle, institutions should realize the value of these experiences and weigh them in a positive fashion in the application process.

Problems with transfer, residency and graduation requirements. Re-entry women often find it difficult to meet these requirements which, like so many others, were often structured with traditional students in mind. As a result, returning women students often find it impossible to get credit for courses completed earlier or to meet other residency and graduate school requirements.[68]

Need for brush-up courses. Many returning women students feel the need for refresher courses, especially in mathematics and study skills. These courses provide needed review of materials and also tend to increase the student's confidence in her own ability, thus acting as an academic and emotional stepping stone to new and rigorous college involvement.[69]

Need for more flexible ways to earn a degree and information on the existence and consequences of pursuing nondegree programs. Due to scheduling constraints brought about by family and job responsibilities, many re-entry women cannot attend traditionally scheduled classes, and thus need external degree programs, week-end colleges, night courses and other innovative programs to increase their access to higher education.[70] Also, as part of this flexibility and innovation, it is necessary to inform re-entry women of nondegree options, such as certificate

programs, and to create more of these options for returning women.[71]

Some institutions of higher learning have begun to develop the types of programs described above in order to deal with the many barriers and problems faced by re-entry women. For example, the Program for Returning Women run by returning women being trained as peer counselors and advocates is a model program operated at the University of Maryland College Park Campus. In addition to providing services for returning students and potential returning students in the community, the program aims at sensitizing the university faculty and staff to the needs of returning women and sharing information with other institutions establishing similar program.[72]

Many other programs exist which have their roots in the Continuing Education for Women (CEW) movement of the 1960s.[73] Though many of these programs have been absorbed into the continuing education divisions of colleges and universities, many still survive in original form. Two-year community colleges have been at the head of this movement. Many of these schools focus on programs that give women basic, specific marketable skills, as well as support programs and other services geared specifically to the needs of re-entry women.[74]

ENDNOTES

1. "Barriers to Re-entry Women: College Transfer Policies, Residency and Graduation Requirements," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980, p.3.

2. Ibid.

3. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women: Meeting the Enrollment Challenge," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Associatin of American Colleges, 1980, p.1.

4. "Second Wind: A Program for Returning Women Students," Counseling Center, University of Maryland at College Park, Women's Educational Equity Act Program, 1978, p.4.

5. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.1.

6. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980, p.2. See also "Re-Entry Women: Special Programs For Special Populations," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

7. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," p.1.

8. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.1.

9. Ibid.

10. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," p.3.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. "Women and Student Financial Aid," A Policy Brief, The American Association of University Women, June 1985, p.2.

21. Ibid, pp. 1-4.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. "Second Wind," p.5. See also, Mulligan, Kathryn L. A Question of Opportunity: Women and Continuing Education. The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

25. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," p.3.

26. Arsenault, Anne G., "Counseling Re-Entry Women in Community Colleges," 1980, p.72.

27. Ibid.

28. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.1.

29. Ibid.

30. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," p.2.

31. Ibid.

32. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.1.

33. "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics," p.2.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. "Re-Entry Women: Part-Time Enrollment, Full-Time Commitment," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980. p.2.

38. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," pp. 2-3.

39. "Financial Aid: Helping Re-Entry Women Pay College Costs," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980, p.2.

40. "Women and Student Financial Aid," p.2.

41. Ibid, p.1.

42. Ibid, pp. 2-3.

43. Ibid, p.1.

44. Ibid, p.2.

45. Ibid, p.3.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid.

51. "Financial Aid," pp. 1-14.

52. Ibid, pp. 3-13.

53. "Women and Student Financial Aid," p.1.

54. Ibid, p.3.

55. Ibid, p.3.

56. Ibid. See also, "Campus Child Care: A Challenge for the 80's," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980, pp. 2-4.

57. "Women and Student Financial Aid," p.3.

58. "Campus Child Care," p.2.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid.

63. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.2. See also, "Re-Entry Women, Part-Time Enrollment."

64. "Student Support Services: Re-Entry Women Need Them Too," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

65. "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.2.

66. "Re-Entry Women: Special Programs for Special Populations," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1970.

67. "Recruitment and Admissions: Opening the Door for Re-Entry Women," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1970.

68. "Barriers to Re-Entry Women: College Transfer Policies, Residency and Graduation Requirements," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

69. "Confidence and Competence: Basic Skills Programs and Refresher Courses for Re-Entry Women," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

70. "Obtaining a Degree: Alternative Options For Re-Entry Women," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980. See also, "An Overview of Re-Entry Women," p.2.

71. Ibid.

72. "Second Wind," p.5.

73. King,Nancy R. & Marjory G. Marvel, "Issues, Policies and Programs for Midlife and Older Women," Center for Women Policy Studies, 1982, pp. 76-80.

74. Ibid.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Due to printing limitations, and in the interest of economy, additional supportive material accompanying this statement was retained in the files of the committee.)

63-226 O - 86 - 3

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you. I think the testimony of this three-woman panel has really been good, and your written statements are good also, very helpful to this committee.

Let me just say this, Dr. Bryant: The inability to pay for child care, in my opinion, is really an important problem. It is one that I am studying and trying to get behind and understand. And I want you to know that we here on the Labor Committee have tried to be responsive to your suggestions, even in advance of today.

For example, we have incorporated a child care provision into S. 1965, the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1986. This should improve the situation because it does mandate that student financial aid counselors include the cost of child care in their calculations of student living expenses.

So that will be of some help to you.

Dr. BRYANT. That is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we need more ideas on child care. A lot of us just do not want another great big massive Federal program we just throw money at things. We think there may be some better ways of doing it.

We also have another approach that I think will help to a degree. That is the Dependent Care Development Grant Act.

But we also need many more ideas in this area. I have always thought it is wonderful to be a liberal because you never worry about where the dollars come from. You just walk in, just throw money at everything, and you can go on the Senate floor during the budget resolution, and you can just come up with these $200 and $500 million add ons and everybody votes for them and then the Appropriations Committee cuts them all out. So it is a nice demagogic, political thing to do but it does not really help. And it really does not, as I say, look at the peripheral and the long-term issues.

And I think we have been doing that on this committee lately. We just have to do it. We have got to have help to adjust program structures to be within existing budgetary restraints. How can we do it?

Which programs are not as good as others? How can we transfer funds from programs that are not as good to those that really are working?

Of course, the easy answer is, well, take funds from the military. Well, you see, a lot of people feel that the national security interests are important. Or some will say take them from all the social programs. Well, some of those social programs work. So we need some help. We are not adverse to listening and making changes.

Let me just ask a few questions of this panel.

What conflicts have there been between your objectives under the Department of Education programs and programs conducted under the auspices, say, of the Department of Labor, HHS or even other Federal agencies?

Do you want to take a crack, Ms. Gore?

Ms. GORE. Senator Hatch, I tried to address some of our problems here.

The Chairman. You have, specifically.

Ms. GORE. I guess the main thing we have seen is programs that have incentives in them become disincentives, or the client is put

in a catch-22 position. If they pursue the program then there are penalties associated with it that they cannot then go ahead and access the program.

For example, as I pointed out, there were the AFDC recipients, if they enter a program and vocation education provides assistance through the Carl Perkins Act, then they actually lose the support that they were having, and the training they are receiving will probably not go long enough where they can earn an income equal to amount need for self-sufficiency—or it will go so long that it will offset any resources that they may have had by AFDC. They end up just being at poverty levels forever because they cannot compete. And then they have to go through and requalify again for their public assistance. If they cannot get back on their feet, they have to go through the cycle again.

Under JTPA, we also seem to have an idea that people have to spend down to the poverty level in order to qualify. People should not have to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Ms. GORE. There are financial conditions, and they are very apt to find that they cannot continue to support their families and also afford the educational costs at the same time. So a person should not have to be living at a substandard level in order to qualify for a training program and to benefit from the support programs which are there to ensure the individual can access the program and succeed in a program.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Fossedal

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Yes. A couple of concerns that we have, Senator Hatch, one is that many times under a JTPA Program, the placement is crucial. And the sooner you place the person, the better it is.

We ran a program at my college, a 24-week training program for secretarial/bookkeeping. Three of those women selected because they did well to move ahead into a 2-year program which will give them much better economic sufficiency in the future, but they are counted as a not positive termination. And the incentive is there, then, for the PIC to discourage a person who would have that idea to move ahead. And that is not proper.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to have that knowledge because we are proud of JTPA; we think it works in comparison to what it replaced at a lot less expense with a lot more placement.

On the other hand, I agree we cannot make placement the only goal. We have got to make sure that the system doesn't discourage initiative.

Let me ask you another question: What mechanisms do you recommend to improve the coordination between Federal and State agencies or among Federal agencies involved in advancing these particular opportunities for women?

Ms. GORE. Yes, Senator Hatch. Florida is one of the States that does have a State displaced homemaker law. The budget is appropriated by our legislature. We have been able to assist displaced homemakers through the JTPA dislocated worker definition of the title III.

And we also, of course, have been designing programs for displaced homemakers under the Carl Perkins Act. We see that in

some communities there appears to be some competition to serve the same person. And we feel as though it will be imperative in our State to develop a comprehensive plan is coordinated so each funding source has specific goals to be achieved And we are working to set that mechanism in place now.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Bryant, I will address this to you: The Women's Educational Equity Act was passed and has been reauthorized with the idea that while in school young women should be introduced to a wide variety of career choices, both traditional and nontraditional.

Now, do you think that if more women grow up with the realization that they may have to be self-supporting or contribute to the income of their families that they will choose more nontraditional courses of study?

Dr. BRYANT. Oh, I absolutely do believe that, and your statistics have shown it.

I think one of the important things about that particular act is the research that is funded and the kind of statistics that we need to move forward. I think that part of the problem is people do not know about these women because they are not part of the normal system in higher education or in training.

So I would hope that the kind of research continues because it is those facts that helps us to get moving on the issues.

The CHAIRMAN. It actually ought to be our goal, really. There is no reason why we should not knock down all barriers to their participation.

Dr. BRYANT. And I think the other piece of that is these women are very practical. They are not going back to college and university or into training programs to float, which some younger students need to do because from 18 to 21 there are not a lot of options other than floating, sometimes. These women are very practical. They want to make that education, whether it is higher education or training, assist them and move beyond their current status.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Ms. Gore, without instituting a federally mandated course structure, how could we more effectively encourage high school students or aid students and women to take nontraditional courses of study?

Ms. GORE. Senator Hatch, we have found that we really are needing to start at a much earlier age than some people have recognized. To wait until the student gets at the career choice position to start talking nontraditional options to them probably is not early enough.

We need to be able to work with the elementary student right from kindergarten on through, creating the awareness with the young girls that they, too, can go into those male-dominated occupational areas, thereby increasing their earning potential.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Dr Fossedal.

Dr. FOSSEDAL. From the educational standpoint, I also think we have a great deal of work to do with our counselors in the high schools and elementary schools, with the admissions officers in our colleges to really educate them on the opportunities for women in nontraditional careers and the fact that they are appropriate. There is a lot of work to be done in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Let me just talk about the value of education. How prevalent is the notion that young women planning to become fulltime homemakers do not need college or advanced training beyond high school?

Dr. Bryant, perhaps you could comment on some of the ways educated women contribute to society, even if they are not in the labor force.

Dr. BRYANT. One of the research studies that we are doing at AAUW is the contribution that women make through their volunteer activities to this country. Volunteerism in this country is extraordinary. It is greater than any other country in the world, and without it, without community activities, without the incredible work of the displaced homemakers, without the associations and organizations that we have in this country, we would have a huge economic crisis if we had to pay for all this.

And so the education level of women and men in their activities that are not paid is extremely important. We need the kind of sophisticated management skills in those organizations as we do in others.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask all three of you this, but I will direct it first to Dr. Fossedal.

What barrier, among all the barriers to women, if you had to identify just one, would you consider to be the biggest obstacle to women in trying to resume their education?

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Well, it is a financial barrier because it takes money. Whether you have a scholarship or whatever, you are taking money from the family in order to get your education. And so it is the finances not only to access the education but to get the child care, to get the transportation—all of those things come together—the medical care.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you all agree with that?

Ms. GORE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you are all completely in agreement on that one barrier?

Ms. GORE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me turn to Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Could I just make one other comment? I have already directed my staff to see if we can find some way, working with Senators Kennedy, Simon, Kerry and every other member of this committee, to resolve the Grove City problem and to resolve it in a way that will be resolvable. Because if it is going to be resolved, it seems to me that the leadership has got to come from the Senate because it really is bogged down in the House and it would be bogged down in the Senate with the House-type bill. There is no use kidding. There are just too many constitutional principles involved that conflict with each other.

I think we could get back to the full pre-Grove City implementation of title IX without any difficulty whatsoever if we can just in good faith get together and lead out and do it.

So I have asked my staff to get with these other gentlemen's staff and let us see what can be done. And I also am challenging you and every other leader here today, male or female; I am chal-

lenging you to help me, in particular, to understand what should be done with regard to child care. Because I have become very concerned about that. I have always been concerned, but I am really concerned about what to do without creating another monstrous Federal program that may not work and that generally sops up a lot of money in administration that really could go to child care.

And it may be that we need a tax approach that gives incentives to the private sector to incorporate child care programs within the orbit of their communities, should I say, rather than their own industry or their own company.

But I would like some help on this because I am prepared to do something about that problem if we could come up with the right solution. I have a number of ideas, but I am not sure that they are going to work. I would like to have you experts tell us what we might be able to do.

People like Senator Simon and I, we have been working together on a lot of things, and I intend to work with him on a lot of things in the future. I think he is a very good man with a really good heart. Let us see what we and the other members of this committee can do.

I have said to Ted that if he and I get together on something, almost everybody has to admit it must be pretty good. It certainly has to be a compromise, but the fact of the matter is we can do an awful lot of good for women in this society if we would; if we get rid of some of the ideology that conflicts with results, I think maybe we could get a lot done.

Let me turn to my friend, Senator Simon, who I think does a terrific job on this committee.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would hope we could try and set some kind of week, 10 days, 2 weeks——

The CHAIRMAN. That would be fine with me, but I think we have got to junk the two bills that are there. They are just too controversial. Both sides hate the other side. Frankly, let us junk those bills and let us concentrate on the one issue; and that is restoring title IX. See, a lot of people do not believe it was institution-wide because it did say program or activity, and it was pretty specific—one of the few times the Supreme Court really did rule on the actual words that were in the bill. But I agree it should be institution-wide and the President agrees, and there is no reason for us to have a conflict on that single issue.

So if we could solve that single issue, then if you want to debate the federalism problem, we will do that, too. But that will be a full-fledged, really horrendous debate; I can guarantee you that. But we could solve this problem.

Senator SIMON. If we could, I think it would be desirable.

The CHAIRMAN. I am dedicated to working with you.

Senator SIMON. If I could just put a word in on behalf of liberals who were attacked a few minutes ago——

The CHAIRMAN. I have been called that myself from time to time, much to my horror. [Laughter.]

Senator SIMON. Whatever camp we are in, most of us do not believe in wasting money. But it is ironic; if you just pour money at random and without end into the defense area, you can be called a conservative.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Senator SIMON. While if you want to spend a few pennies on social programs that help people, somehow you are wasting money.

I am not suggesting that the chairman has suggested that, but there are those who label people that way.

I would add just as a footnote on this hearing, we are having all these discussions about how women can advance, and you have had five U.S. Senators here, all men. There is a little bit of irony in all of this and an indication of the progress that still needs to be made.

Dr. Bryant, if you could follow through on what the chairman mentioned, the child care costs and the student aid. Now, I am not sure we have effectively addressed these problems in the higher education reauthorization bill approved by this committee. I think we have almost done that.

If you could look at that, get back to my staff to see if modifications are still needed, I think that would be very helpful.

Dr. BRYANT. We would be happy to do that.

Senator SIMON. Great.

Ms. Gore, you mentioned the JTPA definitional problem. I do not recall that coming up. We are just reauthorizing JTPA. It has emerged from committee already. When this hearing is over, you get together with Vicki Otten of my staff and we can work with Senator Quayle and his staff. Let us see if we cannot correct that right now. This is a very practical thing that can be done.

You have one other little item in your testimony, Ms. Gore, that intrigues me, and that is adults in training should be permitted to be transported on public school buses upon space being available.

Is the barrier State law? What is the barrier to having this happen right now?

Ms. GORE. We have talked about this in Florida, Senator. It appears that many school districts are reluctant to transport people who are not enrolled in secondary or elementary education because they say their insurance liability is at risk, that they do not carry insurance for others. Therefore, they do not want to transport them

That seems to be the major obstacles and is purely, again, economic.

Senator SIMON. OK. The liability insurance problems these days are pretty major.

Ms. GORE. Liability insurance is seemingly escalating.

Senator SIMON. Yes.

Dr. Fossedal, you mentioned about Rose. What happens where you are, in Batavia, NY, if Rose cannot read and write at all?

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Well, very fortunately, there are Federal funds that come to community colleges and local school districts in New York State and other States to provide adult basic education courses and high school equivalency. And there are many rural women who cannot read, who cannot write well, who do not have their high school diplomas. So they initially go into adult basic ed classes. Transportation, of course, again is a problem. If they are JTPA eligible, we also can fund them through that source and get some assistance for transportation.

Senator SIMON. Are they enrolling or are they being encouraged to enroll?

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Oh, by great numbers, yes. Definitely.

Senator SIMON. Good. I thank all three of you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank all three of you for being here. You have raised a lot of very important issues, and you have, I think, constructively criticized legislation that has been formulated before this committee.

As you know, no legislation is going to be perfect, and that is why we have to followup and try to make it more perfect. And I think your testimony, all three of you today, has been very beneficial to this committee in that regard, and have given us some ideas to think about.

So I really want to thank you for being here. We are dedicated to trying to get these things to work right. And I am dedicated to trying to find the money somewhere to assist in the areas that you have suggested.

So just help us. I have thrown out some challenges to you, and I am sincere on that. I think you have seen we have been able to move a number of bills that I think are beneficial to women. We are going to do a lot more if we can. But we need the right ideas, and I think I share Senator Simon's feeling. You can see the number of women we have in the U.S. Senate; we have two, one of whom is on this committee. And she would be here today if it was not for the operation that she has just gone through. Senator Hawkins has tremendous interest in this area, as you can imagine, and has been, I think, a leader in women's and family issues ever since she has been in the Senate. She has taught us a lot.

I might also add that you will see most of the people backing us up are women. We have responsive people on our staff, and we have ears to hear and eyes to see. And we do want to do what is right.

I am throwing the challenge out. Give us as much help as you can. Add to what you have given us here today which has been very substantive and very helpful. We are appreciative.

Thank you so much.

Dr. FOSSEDAL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me introduce our second panel. It is comprised of three individuals who have been in the forefront of women's employment and training for many years, both as program operators and as advocates.

Ms. Cynthia Marano is no stranger to this committee. As executive director of Wider Opportunities for Women here in Washington, we have solicited her views often and intend to in the future.

I should mention that one of the displaced homemakers who testified at our first Women in Transition hearing was a graduate of the WOW training program.

Ms. Virginia P. Kelson is executive director of the Phoenix Institute in Salt Lake City, UT. She has done great things for women in Utah, and I in particular, am very proud to have you here with us today, Jinnah. I am very proud of the work that you do.

And last but not least, Ms. Myrna Young is executive director of a successful women's employment and training program in Buffalo, NY, called the Everywoman's Opportunity Center.

I want to thank each of you for your participation here today, and we look forward to hearing your testimony. We will turn to you, first, Ms. Marano, and take your testimony.

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA MARANO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN, INC., WASHINGTON, DC; VIRGINIA P. KELSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE PHOENIX INSTITUTE, SALT LAKE CITY, UT; AND MYRNA F. YOUNG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EVERYWOMAN OPPORTUNITY CENTER, INC., BUFFALO, NY

Ms. MARANO. I would like to thank you, Senator Hatch and Senator Simon, for the opportunity to come before you today. Certainly my organization, Wider Opportunities for Women, has worked very closely with this committee on a number of what we think have been important accomplishments. And we look forward to continuing this work with you in the future. We are challenged by the things you have said so far this morning and look forward to discovering some new policy goals we can accomplish together.

In my testimony, I spent the first portion talking about some employment trends that we felt were very important for you to consider as you look at all of the programs that come before the committee. And I am now going to summarize this part of my statement here this morning so that I can spend the most of the time on the recommendations we want to bring before you. But we hope you will take into account in particular the major changes that are happening in the workplace in terms of the move to a service economy, which has enormous implications for women workers. We hope you will take into account the substantial increase in the number of part-time jobs that are being created in the economy. We believe that unfortunately many women are filling these jobs not because they choose to but because that is what is available to them. And we think that the committee needs to take a look at the whole question of fringe benefits and wage and hour and wage compensation for part-time work.

What I would like to do at the moment is to move into the part of my testimony in which I talk about the programs over which the committee has jurisdiction because I would like to spend my time with you making some fairly pointed recommendations.

Of course, the first program with which WOW worked most closely with the committee over the last couple of years has been the the Job Training Partnership Act. Since the inception of the JTPA, several programs around the country have initiated successful, innovative approaches to meeting women's employment needs. And both the Phoenix Institute and Everywoman's Opportunity Center are wonderful examples of how it has been possible to make that work.

The U.S. Department of Labor data reveals that slightly more than half of all program participants in the JTPA are women, yet despite this data, a closer look behind the numbers reveals that the

program has not effectively served the most economically disadvantaged among women.

Particular subgroups of women in poverty, such as displaced homemakers, AFDC mothers, and others who face particularly difficult barriers to employment and self-sufficiency, have had poor JTPA service records in terms of outcomes, quality of training and funding invested. JTPA programs have tended to be structured to deal with the trainee who is motivated, has skills and is practically job-ready and needs few supports service or remedial assistance. This "creaming" problem has had a negative impact on women and girls.

We would like to make some recommendations to you this morning to add to the issues you have been dealing with in the JTPA amendments. We believe that incentives need to be developed for the provision of services to women who are burdened by serious disadvantages, including displaced homemakers, AFDC recipients, young women, and people with limited basic skills.

We recommend to you that you take a hard look at what has happened with what we so hopefully called the 10-percent window in JTPA. We had high hopes that this would be used to meet the needs of people like displaced homemakers. In fact, it has been used—and it is very aggravating to those of us worked on the legislation, I am sure including yourselves—as a cover for administrative error in the States, and it is really disappointing to see that happen.

The CHAIRMAN. Can I just interrupt you for one question? It is my understanding that some States have really utilized title III of JTPA to do some good work for displaced homemakers, but others have not.

Ms. MARANO. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the States have been helpful in this regard?

Ms. MARANO. I believe that less than 10 States have actually programmed for displacing homemakers utilizing title III.

Clearly, one of the recommendations we want to make is that you very specifically define displaced homemakers as one of the special target populations in title III.

The CHAIRMAN. I have already directed my staff to see that we do that. And I am sorry we did not define it better. We thought we had.

Ms. MARANO. Yes, I know.

The CHAIRMAN. It was one of those things trying to get everything together at the last minute.

Ms. MARANO. I remember.

The CHAIRMAN. You were there. I remember.

But we are going to get that changed.

Ms. MARANO. That is good.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Ms. MARANO. The last area around JTPA that is particularly of concern to us is the supportive services area. Again, we worked with you and your staff and many other members of the committee—Senator Kennedy and others—on the whole question of being sure that we would have support services as an allowable activity under the JTPA. We worked hard to come up with a decent

number. We said that SDA's could spend up to 15 percent of their funds on supportive services. We put in place waivers together to allow for expansion of the 15 percent for in need population.

In fact, what has happened is that very little spending is occurring. There are very few places in the country that have even reached 10 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they using it all for administration?

Ms. MARANO. No. Although, that has been a problem in some places.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they doing with it?

Ms. MARANO. They are saying that it is not appropriate to use JTPA funds for supportive services and are using it on training.

The city of Chicago, for example, until this past year, used no JTPA funds for child care. And all of the vendors in Chicago have had a terrific problem maintaining women in their programs because of this. They have not had problems enrolling women; they have had problems with retention, of course.

I would like to move on and talk a little bit about the Perkins Act which, of course, again we worked very closely with you on in the last year. Wider Opportunities for Women has been monitoring implementation of Perkins in the States. And we have been encouraged by some of the progress.

At the same time, we have located some problems, and we will be monitoring even more closely during 1986-87 under a grant from the Rockefeller Family Fund. We are going to be looking at what have been the implementation problems under the Perkins Act for women and girls.

I want to mention just a couple of them. Charlotte Gore mentioned one that I hope you will seriously consider. That is, we worked very hard—and particularly, Senator, your office worked very hard with us—to make sure that it was clear that sex equity coordinators in the States would be the primary leaders in the single parent and homemaking programs and in the programs for young women.

There is still a problem. There are States in which those activities have been assigned to others. There are States in which that single person has been given three or four different responsibilities in addition to the Single Parent and Homemaking Program. And we believe that this is not in compliance with the law. We hope that this committee will ask questions about this.

Second, we have found that a particular and peculiar——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, on that point we will put some pressure on the department.

Ms. MARANO. Please do. That would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. Because I think the law is pretty clear on that. We meant it to be.

Ms. MARANO. I think the regulations were, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. We thought so, too, and frankly, we wanted it to go that way.

As you know, I took a lot of abuse from the House and even members of this committee in fighting for that. I am pretty upset that that is the case.

Ms. MARANO. We would hate to see the Single Parent and Homemaking Program not effective because it could not be administered

by a sex equity coordinator who has been given five or six other responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all sex equity coordinators in the various States operating efficiently and well, do you think?

Ms. MARANO. I would say that given a very broad range of responsibilities, the sex equity coordinators who are in place are really struggling hard to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Ms. MARANO. They were here last week. They have been here for training.

The CHAIRMAN. Do all States have sex equity coordinators in place?

Ms. MARANO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not?

Ms. MARANO. There are still some States where there are not sex equity coordinators.

The CHAIRMAN. Any reason for that that you could ascertain?

Ms. MARANO. I have been told by State administrators sometimes that they have decided that they have not found the appropriate candidate to fill a position. There are some States where traditionally there has been a secondary and postsecondary sex equity coordinator, and there is no one filling the postsecondary coordinator position, and where there are substantial funds involved.

The CHAIRMAN. We will push the department on that, too.

Ms. MARANO. Terrific. We hope you will.

Another concern is that some of the States have used a very peculiar kind of funding formula to distribute the dollars. They have simply sent out the single parent and homemaking and sex equity dollars to the local districts in their State with no strings attached, no real guidelines about how the dollars can be used, no technical assistance. And basically where that has happened, the single parent and homemaking programs are neither visible or viable.

The CHAIRMAN. Are the vocational education leaders in some of these States still antagonistic toward this? Because they were when we put the set-aside in the program.

Ms. MARANO. Yes, I remember

The CHAIRMAN. Does that antagonism still exist? Is that a problem?

Ms. MARANO. I think it has been a problem. I think the other problem is that some of the local school districts have seen severe cutbacks in some of their more traditional programs, and so they are using those dollars——

The CHAIRMAN. They are blaming us for that?

Ms. MARANO. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Blaming women.

Ms. MARANO. A last issue around the Perkins Act is that the Committee and certainly the advocates worked hard to make sure that community-based organizations would be recognized as potential deliverers of services. And it was very clear in the Single Parent and Homemaking Program.

One of the previous witnesses testified to the fact that sometimes at the moment you are seeing parallel programs set up in the same communities. One of the things that has been clear is that in several States, State vocational education administrators have felt that no

dollars should go to CBO's and have instead set up exactly the same programs in a community where a community-based organization was already doing the program rather than pool the resources to extend services effective.

We think that the Department of Education needs to distribute some sort of technical assistance guide on how to work with community based organizations so that it is clear that the department does understand the connection between community-based organizations and the vocational educational system in meeting the needs of the populations we are talking about.

It might be something that the committee could suggest to the department.

I want to quickly move to just a couple of other areas. One of them is the whole question of——

The CHAIRMAN. Could I just ask one other question on the Perkins program?

Ms. MARANO. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just see what that is. [Senate bell signal.]

OK. I thought maybe I had missed a vote. I do not want to miss any votes.

Let me ask you this: On the Perkins Program, you indicated that there is some animosity in some States because of the set-aside. They are blaming the set-aside or women for the cutbacks in some other programs.

Is there any way we could resolve that? Do you think that there is anything that we can do to resolve that? I am sure we could throw more money in, I suppose, if we had it. But is there any other solution to that? Or is it just time that is going to solve that?

Ms. MARANO. I believe that it is a time issue, and I believe also that some of the previous witnesses were talking about the great influx of adult women into the education system. In the end, that expands the financial market for education institutions and will overcome the resistance. It's in the institution's best interest to effectively serve women and girls.

The CHAIRMAN. The success of the program is going to be the best thing.

Ms. MARANO. That is right. When the program succeeds, it will show that this is an important education market for the institutions and that women and girl students can succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. And a good utilization of our taxes.

Ms. MARANO. That is correct. I believe it.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Ms. MARANO. I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about the issues of literacy, affirmative action and the whole question of welfare-to-work before I complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Ms. MARANO. I am not going to go into the very grim statistics related to adult illiteracy, but I would like to say that training in literacy skills needs to be incorporated into employment and training and vocational education programs. We worked to see that there was language in the Perkins Act so that this might be possible under the Single Parent and Homemaking Program. We have to see that more JTPA programs begin to use literacy as part of the training. Because what is happening is that people are being

referred out to adult basic education who do not have the economic possibility of waiting for 6 months while their educational skills are increased. Those individuals are the target population of the JTPA, and we need to begin to weave literacy training into job training. We know it is possible. There are many models. We use one at WOW here in Washington. We know that PIC's and State job training coordinating councils need to realize that building the remedial skills may be part of the job of making a person job-ready.

We would like you to take a look at Senator Chafee's bill, S. 1723, which would fund model programs to assist illiterate parents, many of whom will be single parents, and their children to build basic skills.

Other creative approaches to weaving literacy training into vocational and employment programs need to be identified.

You talked about the whole issue of dependent care, and we have an extensive section in our testimony here which lists some of the things which we think you can do. Certainly you have been interested in the whole area of information and referral systems. We think that it is going to be very important to look at incentives to employers not just to set up child care programs within their own environments, because some but not all employers will do that. By and large most employers will not make that investment. But instead, we must also look at fringe benefit systems that can be put in place by employers and other kinds of services that employers can provide with regard to information and referral. We think that the committee needs to look at what kind of employer incentives you might design to involve employers widely in the child care issue. We would be happy to work with you on that.

I have also listed a number of other recommendations in that area, but I would like to move on to my two final recommendations to you. The first is in the whole area of affirmative action. Wider Opportunities for Women is positive that the continuation of a strong affirmative action policy is a critical element in improving women's access to better jobs in the future.

We are strongly committed ourselves to the retention of Executive Order 11246, and, Senator Hatch and this committee, you can play a critical role in helping us ensure that the Executive order will be maintained. If it is not, we believe it will be critical to codify the Executive order, and we hope that you will take action on this.

The CHAIRMAN. My personal belief on that is that the administration will probably basically endorse the Executive order, but will try to be specific that quotas cannot be part of that Executive order.

Ms. MARANO. You mean through the regulations, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. I would not doubt that that is what the final result will be. Now, whether that rules out goals and timetables, I do not know.

Ms. MARANO. We believe that goals and timetables have been absolutely, bottom-line critical to the movement of women into nontraditional work. And we hope that any influence that the committee can use in making sure that we can retain them will be very important to women's transition into an integrated work place.

You worked, Senator, on the language in the JTPA related to building in an affirmative action component, and we would be very interested in working with you further to see if we cannot get some action in the Department of Labor and perhaps some new programs going based on that language.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me throw another challenge out to you. The Executive Order 11246 has really become a matter of great debate and controversy, mainly because of the quota and preferential rights aspects.

Ms. MARANO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think the administration may come up with something that will ban quotas plus preferential rights and treatment. I do not know, but that is my feeling on what they will probably do.

It may be like *Grove City* that we have got to junk these two bills that everybody finds so heinous in various ways—not everybody, but one side or the other—and come up with a bill that does what really should be done, at least resolve the basic issue and make some progress. Then we can debate the controversial issues in another debate.

But I am wondering, too, if we should not revisit the whole area of affirmative action and see if we can come up with a way of ending reverse discrimination while still providing incentives to be fair to women and minorities.

It has been a very controversial, difficult study for me.

Ms. MARANO. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. I have gone the whole gamut from one end to the other, and certainly I am not on either end at this point. And I would like to have some help there, too. It may be that we should come up with a way of really helping people without the constitutional implications and disabilities that presently exist and that really lead to endless controversy without much help for women or minorities. I just throw that out. I would be interested in any ideas along those lines as well.

It is hard for me to see how affirmative action can work without goals and timetables, even though at one time I was against even those, because they wound up being quotas.

Ms. MARANO. I remember.

The CHAIRMAN. They were quotas in the eyes of some people, including myself. But I also feel that you can be short of quotas and use goals and timetables.

Ms. MARANO. I have spent some time over this last year with three industry leaders traveling in London talking about the United States affirmative action policy. And I have worked with the National Association of Manufacturers in their talking through of their affirmative action strategies.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the reason, then?

Ms. MARANO. I would like to think I had a role. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. You are very persuasive, I have to admit.

Ms. MARANO. I think that their finding has been that affirmative action has been very good business for them; that goals and timetables have been good business for them.

I believe that it is very difficult to argue today that we do not need affirmative action. I think that we need it. I would hate to see

us have to move some sort of legislative situation at the moment because I believe that the Executive order has been the law of the land and that businesses, by far the majority of businesses, have in good faith tried to move forward on them. I do not want us to change that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is true. You know, I am not sure what the administration will do It is certainly taking its good time about it. Because it is a cost problem; there are good arguments on both sides. I think you have to admit that, even though your conclusion is, pragmatically, that it does work.

There are others who feel they make a case that it does not work as well as you think. But I have to admit, I can see areas where it really does work.

Ms. MARANO. I want to just comment quickly on one other issue related, we think, to civil rights and affirmative action, and one where I know we may not have full agreement. And that is that we do support the extension or the passage of the Civil Rights Restoration Act without amendment, and we do think that it is very critical that the whole *Grove City* interpretation be taken care of right away.

I would like to move quickly as well to the whole area of welfare-to-work and just make three points. You talked about WIN here earlier this morning, and while the statistics are not very joyful in terms of the outcomes of the program, WIN currently is providing in very many communities across this country the kind of support services for women in job training programs that are vital. We are going to have a disaster on our hands if WIN is eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. So you think WIN is crucial, then?

Ms. MARANO. Right now, until we have a good reforming or restructuring of the WIN Program, we must continue the funding of WIN or we are going to have a diminution of support services, the things that I know we agree on. To defund it now without having a replacement is a very, very problematic thing for women's employment and training programs around the country. And I think that you would have complete agreement from our network that until we have a real good replacement for WIN—and we would be happy to work with you on that—it has got to be kept in place or we are going to have a tragedy.

The CHAIRMAN. So you agree with me we need to rework it?

Ms. MARANO. Oh, we do agree that we have to rework it.

The CHAIRMAN. My problem is that a lot of these programs are eaten up in administration, and poor administration at that.

Ms. MARANO. We think that some of the WIN demonstration programs, like the Massachusetts program we were hearing about today, do lead us in the direction we want to go. And it is one of the reasons that we think it is absolutely critical to keep WIN in place until we design the kind of vehicle we can really be proud of.

We know that Senator Quayle is holding hearings in July related to a comprehensive look at welfare-to-work programs, and we are going to be working with the Senator on this. But we hope that the kind of program we can come out with is one that combines education and job training and the kinds of supportive services that we think welfare recipients would choose because they want to go to

work. They would choose them because they are looking for economic self-sufficiency

The person we brought before your hearing on Women in Transition last year was the perfect example of that, and we serve 250 women each year who parallel this search for building their own economic sufficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me just make one suggestion to you. I question what the chances are of Congress really reformulating or adopting a real WIN reform if its funding becomes secure. That is the problem around here.

The reason JTPA came into existence is because CETA's funding was not secure, and everybody knew that there were many problems with CETA. And everybody agreed that although it was well intended, it still failed in many respects. That is the one thing I am wondering about; whether we are really going to be able to make the reforms that will make the program work and justify its existence and do what really has to be done for women.

Ms. MARANO. I know that those people who work with the WIN program on an ongoing basis would say to you that WIN's funding has not been secure for the last 4 years. Every year we have come down to the wire with the possibility of the complete elimination of WIN. And every year there has been a sense that we had to do something about it.

I really think that this year we must do something about a look at reforming WIN.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see what we can do.

Ms. MARANO. But if we eliminate the funding, we are going to have a hole that is going to have a terrifically negative impact on women right now. If we maintain the funding and work to redesign the program, we can eliminate many problems.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Ms. MARANO. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to come before you. I am giving you more suggestions in my testimony than those I have presented to you this morning. We look forward to working with the committee in the future on all the things that need to be done to make women's transition into the labor market truly successful.

I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Marano follows:]

20 YEARS **Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc.** SERVICE

A nonprofit tax-exempt Women's Employment Organization
1325 G Street N.W., Lower Level, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-3143

WOMEN'S TRANSITION TO THE WORKPLACE:

TRENDS AND STRATEGIES

BY

CYNTHIA MARANO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
WIDER OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN, INC.

BEFORE THE
SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTE
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986

Good Morning. I am Cynthia Marano, Executive Director of Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc. (WOW). WOW is a 22-year-old national women's employment organization, based in Washington, D.C., which works to achieve economic self-sufficiency for women through employment. WOW works to achieve this goal in two ways. We use a direct services approach as a laboratory in which to design and test programs which lead to economic independence for women; and, we coordinate the activities of a national network of 215 community-based women's employment programs in 38 states. With this network -- called the Women's Work Force Network -- we identify and collect usable models for meeting women's employment, training and vocational needs and work to gain public policies which support and mainstream these models. I am pleased to be presenting testimony today with some of the affiliate leaders of our network who operate exciting and replicable model programs which illustrate the ways in which public policy can stimulate and support effective programs.

I want to begin my comments today by raising a number of observations and trends which WOW believes must be taken into account in the development of policy solutions to improve women's transition into the paid labor market.

The National Shift Toward Services

The nation is undergoing a major shift from an economy based on manufacturing to one based on information and services.

Over two-thirds of the nation's workers currently are employed in industries that provide services such as health care, insurance, trade, education, government, repair and maintenance, transportation, and banking. Bureau of Labor Statisitics calculations show that employment in the service-producing industries will have increased by nearly 30% from 1978 to 1990 -- from 60.4 million workers in 1978 to 78.4 million by 1990. While most working women are employed in the service sector, they participate in only a narrow range of service occupations. Technological innovation is already radically changing many of the jobs in this sector. Therefore, strategies must be developed to insure that women participate in the full range of service occupations, maintain technological currency to remain employable in the future, and garner equitable wages from their work in this sector. This national economic shift means that men's choices of job options will increasingly center on the service/information sector as well. But much must be done to make these jobs desirable and economically viable for all workers. Occupational data tells us that service jobs have historically been less desirable to male manufacturing workers in retraining programs. A primary reason for this undesirability is the comparative lower pay attached to most service jobs. Not only do these jobs differ physically from those in manufacturing but they have inherent barriers to adequate income, such as a generally shorter standard work week, less overtime, and less extensive unionization. The generally lower economic status attached to service jobs requires immediate attention

given to the fact that these will be the bulk of the growth jobs in the 1990's and beyond. Attention must focus on eliminating the built-in sex and race biases which have become institutionalized in wage-setting practices for entire occupations in this and other sections. I do not feel it is necessary to quote for you the statistics which demonstrate the wage gap between women and men; nor do I think we need to belabor the point that even in occupations where women predominate, males generally are paid more. Studies by the National Academy of Sciences and states and municipalities have identified discrimination as the key culprit in the lower pay received by women and minorities. Some states and local governments are already making efforts to eliminate discrimination in their job classification and pay systems. However, the federal government must take a leadership role in eliminating racism and sexism in its workplace, including a review of federal jobs and pay equity, and policy makers will have to concern themselves as well with wage issues in the service sector.

Part-Time Work

The next trend I wish to discuss is the issue of part-time work. A number of myths and misperceptions exist on this subject. We have all been presented with the image of the young mother who chooses part-time work in order to have more time for her children. This image and this choice is increasingly true

for a number of well-educated, professional women; but, it is not the whole truth.

First, WOW questions the current statistical evidence of individuals' choice of part-time work. We know that data gatherers identify as voluntary part-time workers those individuals who knowingly accept work which is under 35 hours per week. The question is not asked whether the individual would prefer full-time work. Therefore, current data gathering methodology masks the number of individuals who must accept part-time work because other work is not available. Further study finds that the part-time workforce is mostly made up of individuals in retail, food services, and other low-paid occupations; well-paid professional occupations make up only a small percentage. These myths and the preponderance of women in part-time work are, we think, an important trend to consider as you review and create policy. National policymakers must increasingly take cognizance not only of the need to adequately pay part-time workers but to ensure that such workers have adequate fringe benefits. This policy need is not simply for a small segment of the workforce but must be looked at in policy making for the future. The rise in service sector jobs -- with their shorter workweeks -- as well as the increasing rate at which part-time jobs are created, demand the attention of policymakers. In the past year, over three million new jobs were created in the U.S. Over 1/3, or 1 million, were part-time jobs. Such considerations as, expanded application of

benefits and workers' compensation laws to part-time workers, an increased minimum wage, and a shortened standard work week may all be needed to bring public policy in line with the reality of a decreasingly full-time workworld.

Self-Employment

The next workplace issue, I'd like to address briefly concerns self-employment. Women's share of business ownership has increased dramatically in the past ten years, with women now owning about 26% of the nation's small enterprise. Self-employment has more recently been heralded by many as a answer for low-income women. Just as self-employment is not a viable option for all individuals, neither is it one for all low-income women. However, if self-employment can be defined so as to meet the individual needs of a woman, it remains an important employment option. Unfortunately, policies and programs to support this employment option/strategy are too frequently based on an upper-middle-class version of business ownership. It is absurd to expect low-income women to succeed in implementing the self-employment option without:

* training in entrepreneurial skills;
* specialized technical and legal assistance;
* access to financing which is flexible and not based on long-standing credit history; and,
* support services.

There are a growing number of programs which are designed to the two-tiered job creation needs of women. The first group of programs are those which increase women's access to the capital and technical assistance resources necessary to create jobs. The second group of programs are those which provide the support services necessary to allow women to take part in job creation efforts.

Within this first category of programs are full-service women's economic development corporations, pooled spaces for women's retail and service businesses, and other business development programs. These programs provide entrepreneurial training, assistance in developing marketing assistance business plans, and venture capital funds. As critical as these needs are, it is the second category of programs -- the support services providers -- which make it possible for women to participate in and have access to the services of the first category of programs. Included in this second category are job training programs, child care and transportation services, re-entry progams for older women, and other programs which assist women at all income levels to consider business development, to identify a potential small business option, and to manage family responsibilities in order to be able to participate. WOW urges Congress to explore a role in assisting states and localities to improve such options for women and to eliminate barriers in job training, AFDC, and other programs which currently impede women from considering self-employment as an option.

Privatization of Human Services

Increasingly, policymakers and administrators are embracing human needs solutions which involve the private sector. Programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act and proposal S. 1990 provide a formal structure through which to transfer broad authority to one segment of the private sector -- private business. We note that the other segment of the private sector -- the private nonprofit sector -- is conspicuously absent from these initatives.

WOW, in designing its own solutions to women's workplace issues, has initiated and maintained productive partnerships with private employers. The reality checks as well as practical expertise and support they provide are invaluable. Yet, we also know that, however committed and well-intentioned these employers are, they are ill-prepared -- and so they tell us unwilling -- to shoulder the burden of human resource development for individuals who lack basic skills and other work prerequisites. This means that employers must rely upon the nonprofit and public sectors to bring individuals to a place where employers can make the investment to turn these individuals into successful employees. We are concerned that the trend of turning program design and decisionmaking authority entirely over to employers will leave many needy individuals without recourse.

Coordination of Human Resources Policy

The final trend I'd like to raise is the need for a coordinated national human resources policy. With increasing frequency, we have testified and commented on proposals and intiatives designed to foster coordination and collaboration between two or more service delivery systems. It is apparent, at the local, state, and national levels, that the current state of service delivery is confusing, is duplicative, and inefficient-- to administrators and policymakers as well as to program beneficiaries. A number of initiatives have sought to coordinate JTPA and the Perkins Voc Ed systems, but few have looked at other support systems such as housing, medical care, and income maintenance. WOW has worked with states such as Louisiana and Maryland to help them develop what we call a unified service delivery system. Such a system has as its goal the economic self-sufficiency of the beneficiary. As such, economic self-sufficiency plans are developed for each individual and the full range of employment, training, education, and support services are brought together to ensure the individual's success. Inter-agency agreements, state laws, and other changes allow for multi- and serial program eligibility and overcome other systems' barriers to collaborative efforts. WOW urges this approach at the national level.

Now, I would like to spend the reminder of my time commenting on some current programs under the Committee's jurisdiction.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

Since the Job Training Partnership Act's inception, several programs across the country have initiated successful, innovative approaches to meeting women's employment needs. The U.S. Department of Labor's data reveals that slightly more than half of all program participants are women. Yet, despite this data, a closer look behind these numbers reveals that the program has not effectively served the most economically disadvantaged among women. Particular sub-groups of women in poverty such as displaced homemakers, AFDC mothers, and others who face particularly difficult barriers to employment and self-sufficiency have had poor JTPA service records in terms of outcomes, quality of training, and funding invested. JTPA programs tend to be structured to deal with the trainee who is motivated, has skills, is practically job ready and needs little support services or remedial assistance. This "creaming" problem has had a negative impact on women and girls.

Many of JTPA's statutory requirements have undercut the Act's capacity to serve those most in need of assistance. The program's "performance standards", which require a high

participant-to-job placement at a low cost have discouraged many JTPA programs from enrolling "hard to place" applicants and from providing the longer and substantive services needed. Second, there is no absolute requirement that local programs must set aside funds for adequate support services such as transportation and child care for program participants. While, as you know, we worked with you to assure that support services would be included, they are almost never spent on the percentage allowed. Though the Act does provide a mechanism (called a waiver) to ensure adequate support services for populations in need, few locales and states have availed themselves of this option. Inadequate support services effectively screen out many women with children.

Performance standards rigidly tied to cost-per-placement have pressured many local program administrators to enroll participants who can be easily placed or those with very limited support service needs. Detailed evaluations of local JTPA programs have documented the impact of the current performance standards on enrollment patterns and supportive services for female participants. For example, the study of JTPA programs in 57 Service Delivery Areas by Grinker, Walker and Associates found evidence of widespread "creaming" to select the most job-ready applicants for training. The Grinker-Walker study also revealed that the sample SDAs were spending only 8 percent of their funds on supportive services, and that only one in six SDAs was spending the maximum amount available for this purpose.

The outcome of this underspending in support services is detrimental to women entering the job market, affects retention of women in training, and severely limits the types of training women can choose. Due these concerns, WOW makes the following recommendations to the Committee for its review:

I. Incentives need to be developed for the provision of services for those women who are burdened by serious disadvantages and therefore are hard to place by virtue of their status as:

a) Displaced Homemakers;

b) AFDC recipients;

c) People with limited basic skills.

II. The 10% window -- designed in JTPA -- to allow those with special eligibility problems under the law to be served -- must be revamped. It is currently used only to cover SDAs' administrative errors in assessing eligibility.

III. Supportive Services

The provisions of Section 108(c) of the JTPA which allow an SDA to request a waiver of the 15% support services spending cap in certain instances should be expanded. It is our observation -- and one which has been supported by other groups monitoring JTPA -- that there still exists much confusion among SDAs and states on the use of this waiver provision. It has been used rarely. Technical assistance from the Department of

Labor is needed to demonstrate that supportive services are necessary for women and can be helpful in meeting performance standards.

We are disturbed that in meeting with local trainers, administrators, and others we have learned that the low-cost-per-placement mentality has been elevated to an iron-clad rule in most areas of the country. This mentality has hampered the ability of SDAs to meet the needs of participants with the greatest employment barriers and to provide the support services which are critically needed by many female participants. To document the impact upon women JTPA participants, on low levels of support services, the Committee might ask GAO to do an analysis of this issue.

III. Displaced Homemakers - Title III

WOW would urge that Title III of the JTPA be expanded to include displaced homemakers. These women have spent the majority of their lives working, unpaid, in the home, raising families, and providing unpaid services to maintain many community and civic programs. At an age when many participants in the paid labor market are contemplating retirement, these individuals find that they must surmount the barriers of age, outdated skills, and limited paid work history to compete for jobs in the paid labor market. JTPA provides few avenues through which this population may be served without regard to rigid income or economic standards. These income standards

unfairly eliminate displaced homemakers who, by virtue of the income of a former spouse or the ownership of the marital homestead, appear to have financial resources when, in fact, they have little or no access to dollars to meet regular living expenses. The specific inclusion of displaced homemakers as intended beneficiaries under the Title III dislocated worker program would help to fill a critical service gap. Though displaced homemakers are eligible participants under several other sections of the Act, there are no specific mandates or targeting provisions for this group as there were under CETA. This has resulted in a lack of data on their representation and a diminution of job training for the population. Since displaced homemakers share much in common with those who have been dislocated in failing industries, WOW believes they may be defined as a target for services in Title III.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, as with JTPA, while very new, also seems to have had mixed results for women. The passage of the Act provided the potential for greatly improving the ability of women and girls to gain marketable skills through the vocational education system. Since the Act contains the largest set-aside of vocational training dollars targeted to female populations such as single parents and displaced homemakers, it has become a significant resource for

increasing the potential for female self-sufficiency. In the past the failure of the Vocational Education system to be a truely integrated system has resulted in the preparation of women and girls for occupations paying the lowest wages and having the least opportunities for advancement.

One year into implementation of the new Voc Ed Act, some problems can be identified, including:

1. Since Congress expanded the duties of the state Sex Equity Coordinator, there is still confusion and some resistance regarding this new role. Many sex equity coordinators have reported that they still have dual and triple roles, due to conflicting interpretations of the new law. Some continue to have responsibility for Office of Civil Rights review, other equity issues, and are assigned additional state projects. This has impacted negatively on those sex equity coordinators' capacity to implement the Single Parent and Homemaker and sex equity programs effectively.

Secondly, WOW found in its initial survey of states, that some states have misconstrued the intent of the law and have given the contracting authority for specific programs to personnel other than the sex equity coordinator, or have not appointed a sex equity coordinator (which was not the intent of the legislators of Voc Ed).

A third concern is that some states used formula funding to distribute program dollars for single parents and homemakers and sex equity. In several states, dollars were distributed to districts without guidelines for use or required outcomes. Many states have effectively designed requests for proposals to distribute these program dollars and some states have set in place strong guidelines and definitions for outcomes in a formula funding process. But in those states where dollars were sent out with few guidelines, programs are virtually invisible.

2. Congress encouraged the utilization of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in the Perkins Act to deliver Single Parent and Sex Equity programs because of their knowledge of program techniques and the populations served. In some cases, rather than contract or subcontract with a CBO already providing a service, states have set up parallel programs in a vocational institution in the same community. This is not an effective method of utilizing funding and imperils the existence of the CBO.

These problems in the implementation phase of the Perkins Act need your attention. Technical assistance to the states by the Department of Education would be extremely helpful. Guidelines for working with Community-Based Organizations in a variety of relationships would also be helpful. We urge the Committee to consider field hearings to learn the successes and

63-226 O - 86 - 4

struggles of the first year of the Perkins Act.

Literacy

In its work in the Washington metropolitan area and throughout the country, WOW has witnessed the increased numbers of illiterate women seeking employment and training services and jobs. Illiteracy has become an alarming, extensive national problem, effecting 27 million adults; up to 20% of the adult population are functionally illiterate (usually defined as 8th grade education or below). WOW is particularly concerned that women and minorities are affected disproportionately by illiteracy. Twenty-three percent of adult females are illiterate as compared with 17 percent of adult males. And among adults, 16 percent of Caucasins, 44 percent of blacks, and 56 percent of Hispanics are either total, functional, or marginal nonreaders. Half of the heads of household below the poverty level (who are mostly female) cannot read an eighth grade book and a third of the mothers receiving AFDC are functionally illiterate.

As a provider of employment and training services and as an advocate organization, WOW experiences daily the negative impact female illiteracy has on women seeking economic independence for themselves and their families.

The problem of illiteracy for women is not only more extensive that that of males, but has a greater impact on women since they are in a more disadvantaged position regarding unemployment and wages. Illiteracy not only affects women in their daily functioning in society but also impedes a woman and her children's chances of moving out of poverty. Illiteracy can be a barrier to women's entry and successful participation in training programs as well as delay a woman's progress in gaining competency in occupation-specific and technically advanced skills. Limited educational attainment has an unbalanced impact on family income for women. Among female heads of household with educational attainment below a high school diploma, 75% were living in poverty in 1981 as compared with 34% of households headed by males with equivalent educational attainment.

Training in literacy skills needs to be incorporated into employment and training and vocational education programs. This is encouraged in the Perkins Act and needs to be expanded under JTPA. This will help ensure that those individuals completing training programs have sufficient skills such as technoliteracy skills needed for the current job market.

WOW urges the Committee to consider programs like Senator Chafee's S. 1723, which would fund model programs to assist illiterate parents -- many of whom will be single parents -- and their children to build basic skills. Other creative approaches to weaving literacy training into vocational and employment

programs must be identified.

Dependent Care

Supportive services such as child and dependent care are essential components to a woman's successful transition to the workplace. Through WOW's work in job training for single parents, we have seen the critical need for affordable and adequate child care.

While costs vary according to the age of the child, most working families expect to spend 10% of their income on child care. In 1984, the median annual income of female heads of household in the labor force with children under 18 years old was $13,213. Ten percent of $13,213 would not cover the cost of the least expensive preschool care. Therefore, even if a woman working at any of the typically female jobs uses informal child care provided by relatives, neighbors, and other systems, she still has a limited number of dollars remaining to cover housing, transportation, medical care, food, clothing, and other life necessities.

The issue of child care is particularly complex when the plight of child care workers -- a mostly female occupational group -- is considered. There are approximately 5 million child care providers in the country today -- almost 3 million of them

working full-time. The occupation of child care provider is overwhelmingly female -- 96 percent. As with many predominantly female occupations, the pay is typically low; average wages for child care providers range from $2,200 to $12,500 annually, depending on the type of child care provided. Although the industry has changed somewhat over the past few years, with the movement toward licensing and increased regulation and commercial child care facilities/services, little has changed for the child care worker. The industry is still, by and large, unregulated, invisible, and underpaid.

In order to meet the extensive needs of women regarding dependent care, WOW supports:

* the involvement of employers, especially private sector employers, in worker dependent care assistance programs;
* increased funding for child/dependent care for low-income workers, AFDC recipients in basic skills and employment training programs, women in education and vocational education progorams amd women making the transition from welfare or training to work;
* efforts to upgrade the professional training and the salary levels of child care providers;
* the establishment of Dependent Care Information and Referral Systems nationwide;
* the establishment of School Aged Child Care Programs through the public schools or other public systems;
* the establishment of national dependent care standards that will improve the quality of care for the children of working parents;
* the provision by employers of adequate parental leave without penalty, upon the birth or adoption of a child.

Affirmative Action

Affirmative Action measures have been critical to improving the occupational status of many women and minority males. As a trainer of women for nontraditional jobs, WOW experiences first-hand the importance of a strong federal affirmative action program in helping to overcome occupational segregation. WOW recognizes that affirmative action is central to ensuring economic independence and equal opportunities to those who have been victims of discrimination and who continue to face severe labor market underutilization.

Studies done on affirmative action policy uniformly indicate that affirmative action has had a positive effect and has resulted in increased employment opportunities for women and minorities. WOW is therefore strongly committed to the retention of Executive Order 11246 which we believe is critical to women's transition into the labor market. If is is not retained, WOW believes the Committee should move to codify the Order.

WOW also supports:

* the implementation of a national promotion program by the Department of Labor to interest employers in the JTPA affirmative action options which have not been implemented since the bill's passage in 1982.

- the expanded enforcement and coverage of affirmative action laws in "new" industries, particularly the new technical industries;
- adequate funding for federal oversight and enforcement;
- the vigorous application of sanctions against federally-assisted employers who fail to comply with federal affirmative action statutes.

Wages

Women continue to be segregated in occupations with the lowest pay and most limited benefits; currently, more than 80% of women workers are employed in clerical, service, retail sales, and factory operative jobs. Even in high tech companies, thought to have the most progressive human resource policies, women are found in the lowest wage jobs and occupationally segregated workplaces. Nearly twice as many men as women hold managerial and administrative jobs in the economy; nearly three times as many men as women own their own businesses; and, women continue to hold less than 10% of all skilled trade jobs.

But labor market status is just one facet of the picture. Women's incomes and earnings reveal more of the story. In no occupational category of the labor market do men's and women's earnings reach parity, even in those occupations in which women predominate.

With such occupational segregation and pay inequities, there is a need for policies which address the gaps women

encounter. WOW therefore recommends:

* an increase in the minimum wage, which currently fails to support a household at the poverty level; and

* a halt to the consideration of the subminimum wage which would undermine the employment and earnings of adults working at or near the minimum wage, yield little or no net increase in employment of youths, and leave young workers without adequate wages to support themselves.

Welfare to Work

For 22 years, WOW has designed and operated training programs and led national advocacy efforts to make women's economic self-sufficiency a priority public policy issue. WOW is concerned with identifying long-term solutions to women's poverty. In February, President Reagan directed the Domestic Policy Council to conduct a study of the welfare system. WOW believes that such a needs assessment must be thorough and focus on programs that need to be developed to meet the varying needs of welfare recipients. Elements of such programs include:

* orientation to choices/pathways to economic independence;

* education and skills assessment to identify acquired and needed skills;

* personal counseling and integrating of critical supportive services, i.e., housing, health, vocational rehabilitation; gaps in any of these areas impact negatively on women;

* literacy/remediation assistance;

* child care services/information;

* career information/counseling which explores the connection between job choices and economic status.

WOW supports reform of the nation's public assistance programs at the federal and state levels which conform to the reality of the feminization of poverty -- that the majority of public assistance recipients are female heads of household. WOW supports reforms which provide comprehensive services to recipients designed to meet their varying needs and circumstances with the maximum flexibility and choice for the individual and with the goal of economic independence. WOW supports:

* a coordinated and comprehensive approach to reform of welfare programs which emphasizes economic self-sufficiency but provides supported and individualized paths to achieving independence;

* public assistance programming which focuses on the distinct categories of recipients and provides appropriate strategies for each -- including those who are structurally unemployed, those who are working poor, and those who are in transition due to family crisis or other emergency;

* continued demonstration programming and program evaluation at the national and state levels to identify solutions for moving recipients from welfare to economic self-sufficiency;

* emphasis on job preparation and job training in public assistance programming for those who choose to prepare for jobs;

* an increase in state level income support to welfare recipients to ensure that recipients receive payments which are not less than the states poverty level income definition. WOW also supports federal legislation requiring states to guarantee recipients a minimum public assistance income support level.

The hearings Senator Quayle will hold this July will

hopefully set the groundwork for a comprehensive bill that addresses the needs of welfare recipients. WOW recommends that an omnibus "Welfare-to-Work Transition" bill be jointly developed by the Senate Committees with jurisdiction over these crucial issues which will coordinate policies and programs and provide both an incentive and substantial support for recipients to re-enter the labor market. Programs like Massachusetts Employment and Training Choices and several of the WIN demonstration projects lead the way to what is needed.

SUMMARY

As we assess "Women's Transition to the Workplace," it becomes clear that while many believe that women have gained equality of opportunity in the labor market, a look at women's employment status in the 1980's proves otherwise.

* Nearly 8 million women are either totally unemployed or employed part-time because full-time work is not available; and

* Unemployment continues as a higher threat among specific groups of women -- 15% of black women in the labor force are officially counted as unemployed, as well as 11% of Hispanic women, and 11.6% of female household heads. Women in these groups are one-and-one-half to two times as likely as the average American to be unemployed.

Families headed by unemployed women are three times as likely to live in poverty as those headed by men. The characteristics of women workers who head families include

higher unemployment, lower educational attainment, more dependent children and lower earnings when compared with other labor force groups, and explain in part the high incidence of poverty in families maintained by women.

For many women, publicly funded employment and training and vocational programs provide the only opportunity for moving out of unemployment and poverty to economic independence. Therefore, programs must address the unique needs of women, if they are to achieve the intended results.

In addition, women who face special barriers -- displaced homemakers, women offenders, adult AFDC recipients, disabled women, displaced workers, and youth -- must have services tailored to meet their particular needs.

The successful movement of women into stable economic life situations is intricately tied to adequate public funding of employment and training programs, equal employment opportunity and affirmative action enforcement. Funding must be maintained for employment and training programs such as JTPA and Voc Ed to meet women's needs in their transition to work. Adequate funding for AFDC, welfare-to-work programs, and other investments in these transitions are equally critical.

We hope the Committee will continue its excellent record of considering legislation in this area and will work with us to implement some of the proposals we have outlined here. Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you today.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate the work that you have helped us with in the past. It has been very, very beneficial to this Committee, and we appreciate it.

Senator Pell, we would be happy to recognize you.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I commend you, too, sir, for holding this hearing on the special needs for women who reentered the work force and seek to improve their education. Working on the Education Subcommittee as I do, I am very conscious of the particular needs of this portion of our population.

I am very pleased, too, that the Higher Education Reauthorization Act reflects this concern that child care be included as an expense to be considered in calculating student aid. Senator Hatch is to be congratulated as well for his leadership in the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act with respect to provisions which mandate programs for displaced homemakers, single heads of households and women who seek to upgrade their skills.

I would ask unanimous consent that my complete statement be put in the record at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will do that.

[The prepared statement of Senator Pell follows:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL (D,RI) AT THE HEARING ON WOMEN IN TRANSITION: REENTRY INTO THE WORKFORCE

At the outset, I would like to commend Chairman Hatch for holding this hearing on the special needs of women who reenter the workforce or seek to improve their education.

This special population of women represents very diverse sets of needs, from the displaced homemaker or single head of household who for the first time finds that she alone must support her family, to the woman who wants to upgrade her skills and education to obtain employment which may be more challenging and financially rewarding. But these women all share a tremendous drive and commitment to upgrade their status in the workforce through the tools of education or training.

I have for a long time been sensitive to the particular needs of these women who face tremendous roadblocks in pursuing this quest. In the last two education reauthorization bills reported by this Committee - the Higher Education Act and the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act - we have made significant provision to improve the ability of these women to increase their education or upgrade their training.

I am most pleased that the Higher Education Reauthorization reflects a particular concern of mine that child care be included as an expense to be considered in calculating student aid. And, Senator Hatch is to be commended for his leadership in the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act with respect to provisions which mandate programs for displaced homemakers, single heads of households who lack adequate job skills or women who seek to upgrade their skills.

The plight of the single working mother, however, remains desperate. The statistics regarding these family units are alarming. Since 1960 the number of single working women with children under 6 years of age has increased by 77 percent. And in 1982, the average single mother with children earned less than $9,000. Education and training for these women remain the only route out of what promises to be a permanently entrenched cycle of poverty.

I am therefore extremely grateful for the benefit of this hearing this morning, and would like to thank the witnesses for their counsel. I would hope that they would focus specifically on the Federal government's role in this area given budgetary constraints.

Senator PELL. And I look forward to perusing the testimony of the witnesses.

I have another committee hearing so I would ask to be excused at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. certainly, you can. And we understand. The testimony has really been excellent, the written testimony as well as the oral.

We will turn to you, Ms. Kelson, and we are happy to have you here, happy to welcome you all the way from Utah. And I just want to personally express my admiration for you in front of everybody here and the public at large because I have watched what you have done through the years. I do not know of anybody more dedicated to women than you have been and more dedicated to helping people like me to understand women's problems.

I, personally, am very much in your debt for the patience that you have had through the 10 years that I have been here in helping me to understand some of these issues, and I know I have a long way to go. You never seem to tire.

So, I appreciate you being here, and we look forward to taking your testimony.

Ms. KELSON. I am very happy to be here and pleased to have been invited to have this opportunity. As the testimony has progressed, I have had an argument about and wanted to contribute to every comment that was expressed this morning, but I will refrain and show some restraint on myself and not do that.

Phoenix Institute is a nonprofit organization based in Salt Lake City. It has a lot to do with birds rising out of ashes and very little to do with Phoenix, AZ. We were grown in Salt Lake City and have been dedicated to the personal and economic self-sufficiency of women since our inception 15 years ago.

We have a history of working and having funding under WIN, under CETA, under JTPA currently; under Carl Perkins we are providing technical assistance to the programs that are being started under the single parent homemaker set-aside, and in addition to that, have been instrumental in the State of Utah in diverting State funds into the problem of self-sufficiency for AFDC clients and have this year finally, after 10 years of work, passed the displaced homemaker bill that will commence after July 1.

So, I believe that I bring to the committee quite a bit of experience in working with populations that we are talking about today.

I am also going to take the opportunity to take rather a nontraditional approach to this testimony today and talk about two or three things that I do not think you will hear from the rest of the testimony. It is not because I do not have equally intense and feel strongly about the things that have already been said. I agree with everything that Cindy said and the panel on education before, and we experience those problems. But I think that Utah, being empty of a lot of people, faces some unique things that I want to talk about.

I am going to anchor my remarks around two particular women, Nan and Beth. Nan is an AFDC client that we have recently been—who came into the Institute about 2 weeks ago. She is on WIN; she is mandatory to WIN because her youngest child is six. She has four children. She has been on welfare, this is her third

trip to being on public assistance. She has gone back to her husband twice and both times has returned to a very abusive situation and left again for welfare with one more baby.

So, this is her third trip around, has a 6-year-old child, she is working at a day care center because her child is six. She has to go to work earning $4 an hour. After school, after her 6-year-old gets out of kindergarten or first grade, goes home alone, the other children come later. All four of her children are what we call latchkey children, and she is making insufficient wages to free her from AFDC. So, she still gets a supplemental grant, has Medicaid and, of course, food stamps.

The prospects for emancipating her are very dim. She has suffered long-term abuse, as 50 percent of the women that we see have. In Utah, 50 percent have suffered physical abuse. In addition, hers has been sexual abuse, and her children are also sexually abused.

So, it is the typical kind of situation that we see where she is forced at a minimal wage, and what she really needs is intense counseling which cannot be provided under WIN, and tons of assertiveness, and then some skill training so that she can be free from AFDC. But those supportive services, again, that Cindy talked about, she can get child care and some things, but the restrictions around them are so limited that we cannot really free her.

The other one is Beth who is a displaced homemaker. She is 36. She has spent 20 years married to a man that has also physically abused her. She has a job as a companion to a multiple sclerosis patient which gives her some very minimal money. She is borrowing to live, and again, she falls through the cracks of the system because she is not qualified for AFDC; her children are grown, although two are still living at home. She does not qualify for Social Security insurance, and again, is one of those that because she has not divorced her husband as yet, her husband makes $80,000 a year, so she is not qualified for JTPA. Yet, she is destitute. And because of the regulations, we cannot move her into a situation where we can obtain the help to get her self-sufficient.

Women like both Nan and Beth come to unemployment and come to the system with a different set of experiences and different problems than men do. They need a wide variety of help, and they need to be able to weave fabric of self-support through a myriad of kinds of help in order to become self-sufficient.

Men tend to have problems of job retention or needing career changes or being displaced from a dying industry, but they see themselves as career people. The women that we see rarely do. They have paid attention to their homes and families. They have not paid attention to careers. They know very little about it, and therefore have to have the career help that can only be provided through a multifaceted program.

I would like to talk about the recommendations that are in my remarks a little bit further and develop those a little bit further because they, I think, are a little bit different. One is that I am recommending that privatization be extended to the nonprofit sector, to the community-based organization. Privatization has meant primarily by the laws that have been done in the past through JTPA specifically the private sector, the employer. The

employers that we meet are a little bit befuddled. They want to contribute; they want to bring women into the work force, but they do not want to provide the kind of support systems that are oftimes necessary to get her as a productive employee. So, I would like to see more development of community-based organization's role in being an anchor and a stabilizer for the woman and that role be more clearly defined.

The second thing is reformation of the regulations. You have talked about WIN today. WIN plays such a heavy role in Nan's situation. We cannot get her the kinds of support she needs, yet she needs WIN to even do what she is doing. So I would agree with Cindy that we need to continue WIN for those support reasons until we have something better. But I would like to see regulations formed that provide incentives to the reward like you have done in JTPA—like paying for self-sufficiency, getting somebody self-sufficiency and allowing programs to do whatever is necessary for individuals to get them to that self-sufficiency. If they need counseling because they have been heavily abused for a number of years, then let us get her that counseling so that she can get into an employment situation that is productive.

Too many of the regulations are restrictive. I guess the most famous one is not providing public assistance to two-parent families. That family is in as dire need as a single-parent family, and yet they have to split in order to get assistance, in order to make it over that threshold into some sort of self-sufficiency.

In my testimony, I have also talked about transportation which is a critical problem in Utah. We can get the whole house of cards with a woman with child care, a job, the training, working, and she may live in West Valley City, which is in the southwest end of Salt Lake, and work at the airport. And there is no bus line that gets her there. We recently had a woman, and I talk about this in my testimony, who ended up riding her bike. She was in that kind of situation. She rode a bike from West Valley City, took her child to child care, then went to work at the airport. Of course, that did not work when the snow started to fly.

I was able to get her a car through a friend who was a car dealer and was able to solve that problem, but there is a limitation on the number of friends that I can get to donate cars. That runs out pretty quickly.

And I would like to see a new look at transportation, especially for rural displaced homemakers or rural single heads of family. We have been able to get some insurance and get women to be picked up by schoolbuses in rural Utah and to school, but the schoolbus does not work when they are in a job because the schoolbus comes home at 3:30 and work goes oftentimes until 5 or 6. So, we can get her to work, or we can get her to and from school, but we cannot sustain her in work.

I understand that the government, both Federal, State, and local governments, surplus cars every year and they sell them, and they sell them for a price that is a one-time revenue source for those entities. I wonder how quickly we could save the cost of welfare by giving that car that is surplused to a woman and let her have it and get to work and become a taxpayer and sacrifice the short-

term revenue that is gained from a car and allow her the stability of being able to make it to a job.

The other one is child care. It is fast becoming a national problem, as it is in Utah, where we have a heavy dose of problems around child care because we have so many children We have a higher number of children and a high birth rate, and the problems around child care are becoming astronomical.

The thing that worries me about not funding WIN is that very problem that Cindy talked about. If we pull the child care money out because of WIN not being funded, it will literally stop a lot of the initiatives that we have gotten going in Utah that have been very effective—namely, the self-sufficiency project and the State funding that goes into training for AFDC clients.

I will stop there and answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kelson follows:]

PHOENIX
INSTITUTE
1800 South West Temple, Suite 211
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
801-484-2682

Statement of

Virginia P. Kelson, Executive Director

Phoenix Institute

before the

Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

April 30, 1986

INTRODUCTION

I am Virginia Kelson, Executive Director of the Phoenix Institute, a non-profit community-based organization that works to enhance the economic and personal self-sufficiency of our women clients. Founded in 1971, the Phoenix Institute has a 15 year history of assisting women to make career choices and find satisfying work. I believe that my testimony, which is based on Phoenix Institute's many years of experience in helping women re-enter the workforce is of critical importance to this committee's goal to examine transition to work issues of women.

I commend the committee for its effective work that has resulted in passage of the Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act funding for programs for single parents and homemakers. The Perkins Act is still in the implementation stage and thus it is too early to ascertain the actual impact apart from the promise envisioned in the Act. Because of this I will direct my remarks, primarily, to the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). However, the promise of Perkins is and does hold hope for impacting one of the most important barriers to women's transition to work, availability of meaningful training opportunities within our educational systems.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS WOMEN FACE

A poet, whose name escapes my memory, wrote that we are what we "pay

attention to." We define ourselves by our activities - by where we focus our attention. I believe that I am in the business of shifting what women pay "attention to." Think with me about this idea. You as Senators spend your effort and prolonged hours of work "paying attention" to the laws and affairs of the Federal government thus defining yourselves as Senators. Most of you came to this work through legal or business careers. The hours and days spent to accomplish your work are long and many. You are strongly identified as "Senator" and most of you have a partner that "pays attention" to your children and home. Her hours of work are long and many, also. She thus becomes defined as a homemaker or the Senator's wife.

The women we see at the Phoenix Institute are dramatically different from you and much like your partners. Their training, their hopes, their expectations have been to "pay attention" to the needs of a husband, their children and their home. They define themselves as homemakers and not paid workers. The typical woman we see may have held a job at one time or another, but, she usually has intermittent and irregular work patterns. Her knowledge of paid work is limited to what she has heard and read about. That limited knowledge of the world of work is and will remain to be, during the time we have with her, something that has rarely been a focus of her attention and something she will focus her attention on reluctantly. This fact creates a multitude of barriers that will probably manifest themselves in various degrees of intensity for the balance of her work life.

In addition to her limited knowledge of the everyday world of paid work, she is limited by her lack of knowledge of diverse careers. The

working women she knows are clustered in a few job categories. When she considers a job for herself she naturally thinks of herself in relationship to those jobs in which she has seen other women. She easily relates to these women not realizing that the positions they hold are extremely demanding and provide very low pay. She limits her own opportunities to the job choices of other women. Already traumatized by divorce, death, desertion, disability or unemployment of her husband, and the low self-esteem and anger that goes with such dramatic life changes, she now faces the limitations imposed by herself and contemporary society.

In searching for and discovering programs that are models of success, or in recommending fine tuning of JTPA, or in developing promising welfare to work legislation, it is vitally important to keep in mind that the experiences that many women bring to the workforce are very different from those of most men. Reorienting what she pays attention to is not just a change from one career to another, or job retention, but a change in how she is with her children, her partner (if she has one), how she does her household work, how she verbally communicates with those with whom she interacts, how she problem-solves, and how she deals with herself. Every facet of her life must be reshaped. It takes time and patience and perserverance and motivation and constant modeling by those that assist her. Staff at the Phoenix Institute are carefully trained and their performance is measured by how they treat clients and how well they model appropriate attitudes and behavior. There is constant attention directed to every staff person's ability to assertively communicate with each woman with whom she or he works.

Regulatory Barriers

In our work we utilize resources from over 10 public systems and approximately 10 private sector organizations. Most clients' needs extend beyond those which one agency can provide. Sometimes the work we do is stopped or slowed down by someone in another organization. We have seen the damage that is done to women by service providers, employment counselors, teachers, etc. in two ways. First are negative attitudes that express individual stereotypes such as:

"Your too old to have that career"
"You should stay home with your children until your children are out of school."
"The best way off welfare is to get married."
"That's not a job for you, that's a man's job."
"You shouldn't be competing for employment with men who have families."

Secondly, lack of agency linkages, coordination and cooperation thrusts women into additional struggles. With cutbacks there are waiting lists. But, even when there is access, program requirements conflict or agency requirements differ, reporting information varies, or there are limitations on times of access to counselors.

Recently, Utah Job Service has gone to a testing program for all participants that mandates testing before referral to jobs. A person's test results will determine job referrals. Therefore, after taking the tests a job seeker must wait for a counselor to call with a job referral. There is limited or no access to job listings. It is

obvious what the impact is. A person must wait by the telephone for a busy counselor to get to him/her with a referral. What if the job seeker is out looking for a job or what happens to those too poor to have phones? This system exponentially limits a person's access to much needed job information. Women who are struggling to simply access information don't have the reserves required to cope with such restrictions.

Child Care Crisis

In 1984 60.5% of all working women with children under 18 years old worked outside the home. The highest increase in the rate of labor force participation was women with children under 3 years of age. Over 9 million women with children under 6 work and yet there are only 1 miilion licensed child care slots. There is a grave shortage of licensed day care in Utah and 55% of licensed child care slots are occupied by children of women on Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Naturally, the youngsters of working parents not in licensed care are in unlicensed care. Many questions should be asked, "what is the quality of this unlicensed care? How vulnerable are children in unlicensed care? Is child care important to our economy and to our national prouctivity?"

As women begin to earn enough money to free themselves from welfare, they hit the incredible dilemma of finding child care at an affordable level in a convenient location, and with a quality they want. The chances of all three of those happening are not good. In rural areas, the problems intensify, becoming nearly insurmountable. Child care

other than that provided by family or friends is non-existent.

Adding to pre-school care is the problem of "latchkey" children. The National Commission on Working Women's Child Care Fact Sheet states:

"By conservative estimates there are 7 million children aged 13 and under who care for themselves for at least part of every day while their parents work. Often brothers and sisters are responsible for younger siblings. There is an urgent need to make before and after school care for these "latchkey" chidren a national priority."

If you have not seen this fact sheet, I urge you to obtain it from the National Commission on Working Women, 2000 P Street, N.W., Suite 508, Washington, D.C. 20036 202-872-1782. It articulates and graphically shows the current and growing child care crisis.

For single parents, child care is a horrendous problem. For working parents it is a critical problem. For the United States it must become a national priority.

Lack of Transportation

A situation that we face time and time again with clients is the case where we have assisted a woman to put all the pieces together: she has a job, her three year old is in child care, her seven year old can go to a neighbor after school, she has learned to be assertive, she has a roof over her head, counseling has helped her reduce her anger, she has been successful at getting a job and after one week on the job her car

dies. The whole carefully constructed house of cards falls apart.

In Salt Lake the buses go to the center of the city. Unfortunately in our spread out metropolis, it is a rare occurrance when home, child care and work are on one bus line. Recently one of our clients temporarily solved this problem by riding her bike. She lived in the southwest part of the valley and worked near the airport in the northwest part of the valley. It took her 2 hours to go to and from work with a stop at child care. However, it was easier and faster than a bus. There were car pools from her area but other "poolers" did not want to get the child to and from child care. Obviously, weather is a critical factor in this type of arrangement. I was able to get her a car from a local car dealer (a friend) which I have done on several occasions. However, I have a "friendship limit" that does not allow me access to as many cars as there are clients with this need.

For rural women the problem worsens. A woman deserted by a man in rural Utah is likely to never put the house of cards together without a car. In some isolated cases we have been able to get a woman to training by using the school bus. But the transportation problem remains after training. Getting that job is exponentially tied to the central issue of a car.

WHAT'S WORKING: MODEL PROGRAMS, JTPA AND CARL PERKINS ACT

Effective programs that have been able to weave together the right combination of activities that can capture and successfully refocus women's attention have some common elements:

1. The programs are multi-faceted. They are designed to overcome external and internal barriers she has to employment. Some external barriers are: transportation, child care, housing, and clothing. Some internal barriers are: poor self-esteem, limited education, low social and communication skills. Successful programs have the resources to deal with all of her barriers. They have a core pre-employment program, on-site skills training or access to community training slots, strong placement activity, access to housing and medical assistance, and on-the-job training slots.

2. They are voluntary. A women can either choose to be in the program or not, and she has several choices or opportunities within the program. She can, with staff assistance, chart for herself an individualized path to self-sufficiency. Mandatory program participation requirements create tough resistance in clients.

3. They provide a unified continuum of services - a coordinated movement through a combination of programs or agencies. She may attend assertiveness training at a community based program and take math at a community school before attending computer training at a technical school. Community-based organizations often take the role of brokering various services for clients. They can be an important advocate and a stabilizing force as she struggles through a labyrinth of services.

4. They provide supportive services such as clothing, work equipment, transportation, child care, medical and housing assistance, and funds for short term loans so she can make it to the first paycheck.

Example: Single Head of Household Self-Sufficiency Project

The Phoenix Insitute and Utah Issues--have joined together to work with district AFDC offices throughout the state to institute a coordinated program of self-sufficiency for AFDC recipients.

Utah's self-sufficiency project is funded by the state of Utah and links with JTPA, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation. The effort begins with the State Department of Social Services self-sufficiency workers in each district community operations office. AFDC applicants and recipients are able to volunteer into a self-sufficiency planning group that lasts from 1 to 2 weeks.

These groups develop self-sufficiency plans that begin a woman's movement through varied paths to work and emancipation from public assistance. Such a plan could include career planning, assertiveness training, adult basic education classes, JTPA occupational skills training, community college training, child care, job seeking skills training, community based internship where employers provide work site experience plus $125 per month (which does not jeopardize her grant level). Additionally, there is supplemental supportive services money to provide immediate resources to remove barriers to her eventual employment. Rural women particularly are in need of this special assistance. They are frequently hindered from making changes in their lives due to lack of child care, tansportation, moving money, or clothing, books and tools. Sometimes their greatest need is crisis counseling and temporary shelter to escape a battering and abusive man.

The self-sufficiency plan goes with a woman and is used by each program to bring her one step closer toward a job. The plan is continually assessed and updated, changed as she needs different assistance or hits additional barriers. This coordinated effort between agencies spells success for many. Sustaining this effort is not always smooth. System workers tend to protect their territories and block effective participation in the project. Regulations at every turn seem to impose unnecessary obstacles such as differing agency requirements, different formats, endless questions requiring answers before participation is approved. Recently the Utah Department of Social Services issued a new applicant form that was 17 pages long. In a simulated try at filling out the application with AFDC clients most could not complete the form adequately (Social Serices has since redesigned and shortened the form).

Endless meetings must occur between agency and community-based organization staff to maximize communication and minimize the glitches that can quickly deter clients or frustrate fragile relationships with employers who supply the internship slots. But the self-sufficiency project is a multi-faceted program with a unified systems approach to affirmatively move women from grants to a regular paycheck. In a short time it has accomplished a great deal.

Job Training Partnership Act

The changes brought by JTPA have been effective. The ACT sets a precedence in government social programs. The implementation

procedures used by the SDA with whom we contract, Wasatch Front South, have been smooth, fair and cooperative although we were dragged kicking and screaming through the change from CETA to JTPA. I know that performance based contracting has been unevenly implemented by Private Industry Councils (PIC's). Implementing procedures have been tough and sometimes costly for their sub-contractors. That has not been the case for us. Wasatch Front South PIC's attitude has consistently been to make the transition from CETA to JTPA as easy and even as possible. Consequently, we have been able to continue services and enhance our work unemcumbered by line- item budgeting and the costly auditing that went with them. We are paid for what we do - enrollments, completions, placements and retentions. It works and is highly motivating to the staff assigned to the project. Our attention has been effectively shifted to outcomes.

A higher level of funding is needed. This time of year we run out of training slots and many women needing assistence must wait. Minimal level funding also enhances the "creaming" for which JTPA is criticised. The easiest to serve can be assisted at a lower cost and moved quickly to self-sufficiency. Therefore, the rule "more for less" causes "creaming." The hard-to-serve have multiple barriers to overcome and need more services and for a longer period of time.

In collaboration with WFS we have been able to steadily increase the number of women served to 60%. Of that group 30% are AFDC recipients. (This accomplishment is in addition to the state funded single head-of-household self-sufficiency program that serves 2,000 AFDC recipients.) Incentive money earned last year was spent to serve 40

displaced homemakers who otherwise would not be served or would have had to wait for their six month qualifying period or the 1986-87 program year. In order to reach this high female enrollment number, we are constant and persistent with outreach efforts.

Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act

Phoenix Institute has been instrumental in initiating and providing technical assistance to six single parent/homemaker projects funded by the State Department of Vocational Education. With the exception of two, the projects are new and in their beginning stages. The promise of these campus based projects is a greater access and retention of women in non-traditional training slots in Utah's vocational technical schools, and greater penetration into rural areas - reaching out to the desparate women who have so very few resources. The latter promise is already beginning to unfold. The former promise needs much work. Our experience tells us that the multitude of resistant factors that enforce occupational segregation for women, are alive and thriving. Change in this area will be extremely slow, painful yet a strong and determined effort must be made.

REGULATORY REFORMATION

1. A reformation is needed to shift the focus of human service program regulations to outcomes rather than the current focus on restrictions. Many agencies are steered into activities that are designed to catch those that abuse the rules. Additionally, there are restrictive rules that encourage the dependency of recipients on welfare. For example,

there is the restriction of service to 2-parent families. I question what purpose is served by restricting service to two parent families? The family is in trouble and needs assistance. Why not pay for getting the family self-sufficient rather than pay the cost of policing the family to be sure there is only one parent in the home.

There are rules that create disencentives to welfare emancipation such as the potential loss of child care support before the woman earns enough to assume the child care cost, or the loss of medical support before she is employer insured. If regulations required a demonstrated achievement such as client self-sufficiency, workers' attitudes would be refocused to how to get that done. Personal opinions or cultural stereotyping would be quickly put aside because they block the road to client self-sufficiency and prevent the achievement of the results required.

Performance based rules that reward for results, bring more regulatory flexibility which could allow extension of child care or medical maintenance in some needy cases. This committee needs to look at its own work with JTPA to discover the change that has occurred as a result of performance based contracting. There could be some fine tuning needed with JTPA. There are places where the process has worked better than others, but, in general, our experience at the Phoenix Institute with performance based contracting under JTPA, is that we have been able to do about the same work for less money and be more flexible with what we do in individual cases and apply tactics that get the job done.

A specific JTPA regulation that should be changed is the one that

requires a displaced homemaker to wait six months after divorce, death or the disability of a spouse to become eligible for programs under Title IIA. Allow her to qualify whenever she is economically disadvantaged. Sometimes that happens immediately, sometimes in 2 months, sometimes 6 months, sometimes 9 months. The arbitrary six month restriction makes no sense.

Also, allow displaced homemakers to qualify as dislocated workers under Title III. They are as dislocated from work as other workers and they are as traumatized and in as much need of the retraining services.

2. The potential of privitization of governmental human services programs needs to be systemically examined. Privitization creats competition. Competition decreases costs and increases quality and results. Privitization creates jobs and promotes creativity. Privitization would mean contracting services to small, non-profit, community-based organizations. I'm convinced that a smaller organization can be attentive, innovative and supportive of clients, whereas a large bureaucracy under a civil service system encourages inattentiveness, strict adherence to traditional solutions, and detachment from clients. This is not to say all government workers are inattentive and unsupportive of clients, only that such behavior and attitudes are inherent to large bureaucracies and large organizations.

Further, privitization is less costly. The Employment Service and the Educational Institutions cannot provide the same level of services for the price tag that is attached to services provided by a

community-based organization. Is it smart to have government in competition with the private non-profit sector especially when it costs more? I believe there are many services that could be done better at less cost and with better results by the privitization of appropriate human services. It is imperative to discern what the role of government is, what it can do better than the private sector. And it's imperative to discern the role of the private non-profit sector. What can it do better than government?

CHILD CARE

Children are our greatest national resource - not oil, not tobacco, not cars. Yet we have little national attention paid to the growing problems of child care. Congress needs to take the lead by:

1. A "focused awareness" on the problems of child care. Child care is not "just a women's problem." This is a national problem, a worker's problem, an employer's problem. Appoint a commission, have hearings, create necessary legislation, do whatever is appropriate for this body to do to "focus awareness" on the problem.

2. Relook at tax incentives to employers who capitalize child care centers at or near the work site. There are 6 million employers and only approximately 1,500 provide child care benefits. Therefore, current incentives are not enough. It is well documented that productivity improves when workers are free from concerns regarding their children. It is in the best interest of employers as well as workers to have access to quality child care.

TRANSPORTATION

Every year the national, state and local governments of this nation "surplus" government cars, selling them or junking them. What if some of the cars, the ones that are operable were given to welfare recipients who needed them to get a job or keep a job? Could the revenue lost from car resale be much more than the cost to support an individual on welfare. Probably not. It would take only 2 or 3 months of welfare grants to quickly exceed the amount lost.

Another possibility is that used car dealers could be given a tax incentive to give cars to deserving welfare people. Every month or so car dealers send unsold cars to be junked. Some of them are operable or could be operable with some fixing. These are the cars I have gotten donated to women in the past. Availability of cars could spell success for many women.

FUNDING OF JTPA AND CARL PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Although the current need to reduce spending is a critical focus of Congress, I want to make a plea for fully funding the incentive programs of JTPA and the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act. They are the best way the growing number of poor people can escape poverty and become taxpayers. There is no better "safety net" than a job. There is no better way for a child to grow up than in a home that is free of poverty. And there is no better way for anyone to achieve high self-esteem than by independence and self-sufficiency. Only through

these progams can we as a nation intercede in the growing feminization of poverty.

CONCLUSION

I thank you for taking time to hear my concerns and for seeking first-hand knowledge of the transitional home to work employment problems of women. I appreciate the chance to raise these issues and assist you in your effort to improve our capabilities to provide quality effective services to women.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Jinnah.

Ms. Young, let us turn to you.

Ms. YOUNG. Thank you.

My name is Myrna Young. I am executive director of Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc., which is a not-for-profit membership corporation established in 1977 to serve the disadvantaged in employment services and training area. In this capacity and others, I have designed, implemented and administered training programs targeted for a variety of groups and funded by a variety of local, State and Federal agencies and organizations, private as well as public.

Currently Everywoman Opportunity Center, which has helped to place over 2,300 individuals in jobs and over 1,000 individuals in further educational slots in the last 5 years, administers the Displaced Homemaker Centers of western New York, which is part of New York State's model Displaced Homemaker Program.

I am here representing the directors of those 16 centers as well as representing Everywoman Opportunity Center's Board of Directors, staff and program participants.

I would like to share with you what I have learned in the last 8 years about how employment and training programs are working for the participants I worry about the most—women, displaced homemakers, teen-aged mothers, the older woman worker—and tell you how these observations lead me to believe that current programs, especially those under governmental initiatives, are not serving enough and/or adequately the disadvantaged of any age, sex, or color.

When I speak of the disadvantaged, I am not speaking only of money or the lack of it, but also of the many barriers such as age, sex, color, and lack of education that can make one disadvantaged in dealing with the business and employment world.

It is important to define this term because many of the existing employment and training programs such as those funded by the Federal Job Training Partnership Act do have financial eligibility requirements; indeed, such stringent ones that many programs have a difficult time recruiting financially eligible participants.

So what is the problem? Have I contradicted myself? No, I have not. Let me tell you how current JTPA funded programs work against women, especially older women participants. Cliches immediately come to mind—"penny-wise, pound-foolish," "with the best intentions," et cetera—but the truth is, in an attempt to make employment and training programs more cost effective—the attempt we applaud, the results we do not—the Federal Job Training Partnership Act regulations and State and local interpretations of those regulations have led to short, performance based contracts. Short meaning under a year including all services, placement time, and performance meaning the performance of the participants, not the performance of the training institution; which has led to the creaming of participants and the departure of many experienced, sensitive and qualified community-based organizations and other training institutions from the training arena.

Creaming. This is probably the biggest problem in terms of participant service. And that is when a service delivery area or community-based organization or training institution is told that they

63-226 0 - 86 - 6

will only get reimbursed for training costs when a participant is trained, placed on the job for 30 days or slightly longer, and at a specified wage. And only then they can accept for training only aces, straights, and flushtype participants who could probably get the jobs on their own and who already have job skills.

So the older, or maybe young with small children, maybe uncertain, possibly black, ninth-grade educated, no recent paid work experience woman is not selected time after time. We have quit referring those women to JTPA funded programs because it is another rejection for them that they have to rebound from. They do not get in.

Current attitudes reflected in legislation and policies attached to most governmentally sponsored training programs do not allow training for those most in need of training and those our country most needs to help become self-sufficient and contributing members of our communities because it takes longer to train those and it takes more work to train those.

The swelling numbers of social service recipients, the homeless, and the hopeless are expensive and painful testimonies to the failure of the system. Why is it so hard for Government planners at all levels to see what those of us working in the field have known and been vocal about for years: That if there is not enough money, time and support for quality training programs up front, it will cost us all a lot more later in skyrocketing crime, increased welfare bills, and a significant loss of human potential and contributions. I could go on like this, but I would rather tell you what I think would work.

No. 1, we need to develop and implement training programs that allow phases of training that may last over a year or two, recognizing that job and life skills that command a living wage cannot be learned in 6 months. A key element in the success of these programs is the commitment to a holistic and individual approach to job training and placement. Some job programs fail because they do not take the life and career needs of the individual into account. The push is for getting people off of public assistance and into a job, any job, at any cost to the individual. When the primary needs of the individual are not met, it is no wonder that, once in the work force, the worker appears dissatisfied, poorly motivated, and unrealiable in attendance and job performance. This problem is intensified in entry level, low paying and unrewarding positions where the poor and minimally educated person is placed. Programs that focus only on placement often fail to encourage individual development and do not provide necessary education in career development skills. These skills are essential for the individuals to have if they are to compete and succeed in the job market over the long term, and quit that repeating back into the welfare system over and over again.

No. 2, we need to provide transitional incentives so that women with children or other dependent care responsibilities can get off of welfare without jeopardizing their children's health and well-being. Continuing food stamps, child care assistance and social service payments while an individual is successfully reaching planned education and employment goals is a very small, very cost effective price to pay, even if paid over the course of several years, for not

just an individual but a family to get off of welfare because we know that families continue the cycle.

No. 3, put some power behind the rhetoric praising homemakers and mothers by providing services, supportive services, with training and educational programs that take into consideration woman's dual role in our society instead of allowing her to be victimized by it. With the growing number of single parents and the statistical evidence that suggests that a majority of women can expect to be, at some time in their life, the sole provider for self and family because of divorce, separation, death of spouse, disability of spouse or what we are now seeing in unemployment of spouse, the need for inexpensive or cost-free quality child care is critical. For many single parents, welfare is the only way they can provide care for their children despite their desire to work. We know they want to work. We see them every day. Even though it is in the employer's best interest in maintaining and attracting personnel, employers have provided little help for child care needs. In the same way, employers are given tax credits to employ specific groups of needy individuals, I believe tax credits could be given to employers that provide in-house child care or other kinds of cafeteria benefits to their employees. The lack of quality dependent care and the lack of money to pay for it where it exists are the largest barriers to women achieving and maintaining success in employment.

No. 4, allow for the greater participation at all levels by community-based organizations and advocacy groups who are both your greatest resource in recruiting and the Government's best partner in the goals—the goals of getting our constituents off welfare and into productive, happy, well-paying lives. I have attached to this testimony a description of several successful programs administered by community-based organizations that have or would have difficulty in getting funded under current guidelines, although they are doing good work.

One morning as I was driving to work, I heard on the news about a man who had been unemployed for months. He killed his wife, his two daughters and himself. The commentator then said he was despondent about not being able to find work and that his wife had been holding down two jobs to keep the family together.

I know immediately that someone will think, if that man had had a job he would not have done that, maybe. But my thoughts immediately went to that woman who could not find one job that paid enough to support her family, but she found two—probably two jobs that paid $3.35 an hour and had few or no benefits. Maybe if she had been able to find one job that paid enough, he would not have done it. Maybe. I think this is, admittedly, a round-about way of saying that there are wide-ranging, detrimental effects of training the disadvantaged in jobs that, while real, are dead-end and low paying. A longer range approach is needed.

In closing, we at Everywoman Opportunity Center, the National Displaced Homemaker Network and numerous other community-based organizations across the nation welcome the opportunity to work with this committee and Congress in bringing more successful training and employment opportunities to those needing them the most.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Young follows:]

Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc.

Myrna F. Young, Executive Director
237 MAIN STREET, SUITE 330
BUFFALO, NY 14203
716/847-1120

Statement of

Myrna F. Young, Executive Director

Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc.

before the

Committee on Labor and Human Resources

April 30, 1986

Senator Hatch, Members of the Senate Commitee on Labor and Human Resources, I am Myrna F. Young, Executive Director of Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc., a not-for-profit membership corporation established in 1977 to serve the disadvantaged in the employment services and training area. In this capacity and others, I have designed, implemented and administered training programs targeted for a variety of groups and funded by a variety of local, state, and federal agencies and organizations, private as well as public. Currently, Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc., which has helped to place over 2,300 individuals in jobs and over 1,000 individuals in further educational slots in the last five years, administers the Displaced Homemaker Centers of Western New York, part of New York State's model Displaced Homemaker Program. I am here representing the Directors of those sixteen Centers as well as representing Everywoman Opportunity Center Inc.'s Board of Directors, staff and program participants.

I would like to share with you what I've learned in the last eight years about how employment and training programs are working for the participants I worry about the most --women --displaced homemakers -- teen-aged mothers -- the older woman worker--and tell you how these observations lead me to believe that current programs, especially those under governmental initiatives are not serving enough and/or adequately the disadvantaged of any age, sex, or color. When I speak of disadvantaged, I am not speaking only of money or the lact of it, but also of the many barriers such as age, sex, color, and lack of education that can make one disadvantaged in dealing with the business and employment world.

It's important to define this term because many of the existing employment and training programs such as those funded by the Federal Job Training Partnership Act do have financial eligibility requirements - indeed such stringent ones that many programs have a difficult time recruiting financially eligible participants.

So what is the problem? Have I contradicted myself - No, I haven't. Let me tell you how current Job Training Partnership Act funded programs work against women, especially older women participants. Cliches immediately come to mind - "penny wise and pound foolish," "with the best intentions," etc. But the truth is, in an attempt to make employment and training programs more cost effective (the attempt we applaud, the results we do not) Federal Job Training Partnership Act regulations and state and local interpretations of those regulations have led to short, performance based contracts (<u>short</u> - meaning under a year including all services and placement time and perforance meaning the performance of the participants, not the performance of the training institution), which in turn has led to creaming of participants and the departure of many experienced, sensitive, and qualified community based organizations and other training institutions from the training arena.

Creaming - when a service delivery area, or a community based organization, or training institution is told that they will only get reimbursed for training costs when a participant is trained,

placed on the job for thirty days, and at a specified wage, they can only accept for training Aces, Straights and Cinch-type participants - who could probably get those jobs on their own and who already have job skills. So our older, or maybe young with small children, maybe uncertain, possibly Black, 9th grade educated, no recent paid work experience woman is not selected time after time.

Current attitudes reflected in legislation and policies attached to most governmentally sponsored training programs do not allow training for those most in need of training and those our country most needs to help become self sufficient and contributing members of our communities. The swelling numbers of social service recipients, the homeless, and the hopeless are expensive and painful testimonies to the failure of our system. Why is it so hard for government planners at all levels to see what those of us working in the field have known and been vocal about for years----that if there is not enough money, time, and support for quality training programs upfront, it will cost us all a lot more later----in skyrocketing crime, increased welfare bills and a significant loss in human potential and contributions. I could go on in this vein but rather than that I would like to tell you what I think would work.

(1) develop and implement training programs that allow phases of training that may last over a year or two-- recognizing that job and life skills that command a living wage cannot be learned in six months. A key element in the success of these

programs is the committment to a holistic and individual approach to job training and placement. Some job programs fail because they do not take the life and career needs of the individual into account. The push is for getting people off of public assistance and into a job, any job, at any cost to the individual. When the primary needs of the individual, are not met, it is no wonder that once in the work force the worker appears dissatisfied, poorly motivated, and unreliable in attendance and job proformance. This problem is intensified in entry level, low paying, and unrewarding positions where the poor and minimally educated person is placed. Programs that focus only on placement often fail to encourage individual development and do not provide necessary education in career development skills. These skills are essential for the individuals to have if they are to compete and succeed in the job market over the long term.

(2) Provide transitional incentitives so that women with children or other dependent care responsibilities can get off of welfare without jeopardizing their children's health and well being. Continuing food stamps, child care assistance and social service payments while an individual is successfully reaching planned education and employment goals is a very small, very cost effective price to pay (even if paid over the course of several years) for not just an individual but a <u>family</u> to get off of welfare.

(3) Put some power behind the rhetoric praising homemakers and mothers by providing services - supportive services - with training and educational programs that take into consideration woman's dual role in our society instead of allowing her to be victimized by it. With the growing number of single parents and the statistical evidence that suggests that a majority of women can expect to be, at some time in their life, the sole provider for self and family because of divorce, separation, death of spouse, disability of spouse or unemployment of spouse, the need for inexpensive or cost free quality child care is a necessity. For many single parents, welfare is the only way they can provide care for their children despite their desire to work. Even though it is in the employer's best interest in maintaining and attracting personnel, employers have provided little help has been provided for child care needs. In the same way employers are give tax credits to employ specific groups of needy individuals, I believe tax credits could be given to employers that provide in-house child care. The lack of quality dependent care and the lack of money to pay for it where it exists are the largest barriers to women achieving and maintaining success in employment.

(4) Allow for the greater participation at all levels by Community Based Organizations and advocacy groups who are both your greatest resource in recruiting and the government's best

partner in the goals - the goals getting our constituents off welfare and into productive, happy, well-paying lives. I have attached to this testimony a descripion of several successful programs administered by CBO's that have or would have difficulty in getting funded under current guidelines.

One morning as I was driving to work, I heard on the news about a man who had been unemployed for months. He killed his wife, his two daughters, then himself. The commentator then said he was despondent about not being able to find work and that his wife had been holding down two jobs to keep the family together.

I know immediately someone will think, if that man had had a job he wouldn't have done that, maybe. But my thoughts immediately went to that woman who couldn't find one job that paid enough to support her family, but she found two - probably two jobs that paid $3.35 an hour and had few or no benefits! Maybe if she had been able to find one job that paid enough, he wouldn't have done it. Maybe. I think this is an admittedly round-about way of saying that there are wide-ranging, detrimental effects of training the disadvantaged in jobs that while real-are dead end and low paying. A longer range approach is needed.

In closing, we at Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc., The National Displaced Homemakers Network, and numerous other community based organizations across the nation welcome the opportunity to work with this committee and Congress in bringing more successful training and employment opportunities to those needing them the most.

Thank you.

Model Programs

(1)

Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc.'s Project Employ/Enrich program which provides services to significant adults in the families of head start children is designed to overcome the problems inherent in pure job placement programs. This program deals with six major areas that influence employability. They are: Psychological/ Personality Factors, Physical Factors, Personal Resources, Skills/ Learning/Education Factors, Environmental Factors, and Tools/ Placement Factors. A participant's employment possibilities and success depend on his or her ability to reflect positively to an employer in the areas mentioned above.

The Project Employ/Enrich program is designed to meet participants' needs in all of these areas depending on development level and current needs. The enrichment aspect of this program encourages development in the Psychological/Personality Area, Physical Area, and Resources areas. These areas are essential building blocks for job search, networking, contacting, and interviewing skills. At this point, parenting skills and child development information are also important in order to stabilize the home environment to the point where the parents may consider employment. This is the first step in job readiness for many people, especially single parents. The educational aspect of this program encourages development in the Skills/Learning/Education areas. This is the best opportunity for the participants to gain employment at a higher skill level, avoiding entry level and minimum wage jobs.

It is only after at least a minmum developmental level is achieved in these four factor areas that the participant can benefit from the employment skills training aspect of our program. It is only at this point that knowledge and skills in the Environmental Factors and Tools/Placement Areas become useful. In most placement programs many of the above mentioned factors are ignored. This accounts for the lact of positive, long term placements in programs that don't provide the needed enrichment activities for their participants. The continued success of the Everywoman Opporunity Center, Inc. Project Employ/Enrich program is dependent on approaching the needs of the participant in a holistic fashion. Thus, parenting skills become as important as interviewing skills, and job readiness must be achieved before job search skills can be taught. Participants need to have their needs met where they are, not where social programmers want them to be. Only then can success be achieved.

(2)

New York State's Sixteen Displaced Homemaker Center directors are innovative and resourceful. The director of the Schenectady program has assured services throughout the Albany districtg by piecing together bits of funding and donated services from many

sources. A special program aimed at hispanic women in the Amsterdam area will be instituted at Fulton-Montgomery Community College with State Department of Labor and Education funding and Department of Social Services cooperation. Course materials will be prepared in Spanish with the assistence of volunteer translators. Participants can progress through a job-readiness segment in Spanish, to English as a second language, to a special math and science preparation leading to training for technical careers at the college.

In Glens Falls she has combined federal funding through JTPA and Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act funds through the local Board of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) to fund three Job Readiness cycles.

She is also responsible for all the administrative duties of running the basic Department of Labor Grant. These duties run the gamut from supervising staff to preparing statistics to teaching classes herself. With a basic grant of $113,000 (which includes 25,000 for the Fulton-Montgomery operation) she is unable to provide the full services necessary to support displaced homemakers making the transition to independence and will have to do some serious funding-raising this year.

* * *

In New York City, the director at the YWCA Displaced Homemaker Program has also assumed duties of Career Education Director for the YWCA, with a prorated salary for each postion. The certified Social Worker-Counselor she hired with the savings from her salary has geometrically increased the services the center can provide to participants with pervasive family problems. She has also broadened the opportunities for skills training for displaced homemakers by providing scholarships to the YWCA's fee-based courses.

Although her salary is prorated between the two positions, her responsibilities are not. She is, in fact, holding two full-time jobs. Ideally, we would like to see this program have enough funding to keep their new counselor and to hire a full-time director.

The salaries of these superwomen and the 14 others like them are far from commensurate with the effort and creativity they bring to their jobs. Full-time director's salaries ranges from $15,772 to $35,544 and average under $23,000. The state program which is funded for 2.6 million, counsels, refers, trains, and places thousands displaced homemakers a year -- at a cost of approximately $687.00 per job placement.

(3)

Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc. is a non-profit membership corporation with IRS 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. Everywoman's purpose is to help unemployed residents (particularly women) of the Greater Buffalo area to become self-sufficient, financially independent members of the community. The Center provides programs designed to meet the unique needs of women who must enter or re-enter the job force but lack the necessary confidence, self-esteem, skills and work experience to find employment. Everywoman was incorporated on April 1, 1977 and is governed by a twenty-three person Board of Directors which meets monthly. An annual membership meeting is held.

Everywoman has a successful history of operating government funded employment and training programs.

The New York State Legislature enacted a Displaced Homemaker Act in August, 1977. This legislation intended to establish service centers for displaced homemakers in order to provide them with the counseling and training opportunities they needed to enter the work force and earn a living. Services to be provided include job counseling, training and placement, health education and information, financial management services, educational and outreach services. Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc. was selected to administer New York State's pilot program. This $95,000 project, funded by the New York State Department of Labor, started on May 1, 1978 and was completed on November 30, 1978, proving not only the need for displaced homemaker services, but also that persons without recent paid work experience can be taught to successfully job search. The Displaced Homemaker Program of Western New York includes four multipurpose Centers located in Niagara Falls, Tonawanda, Fredonia and Buffalo. In 1984, and outreach was added. On April 30, 1985, Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc. completed its seventh Displaced Homemaker project. Over the years, the Western New York Displaced Homemaker Centers have consistently met or exceeded their total performance goals.

In January of 1978, Everywoman operated an autonomous program under Erie County Employment and Training designed to address the employment-related needs of women, particularly in the area of "readiness" for non-traditional work. During the eight month contract period, a total of 105 participants were served.

Also in January of 1978, Everywoman began a City of Buffalo Employment and Training Project. The purpose was to conduct neighborhood workshops through-out the city. As a result of these contracts, a profile of the 480 women served was developed and forwarded to the city for planning purposes.

In September of 1980, with funds from the Niagara County Department of Employment and Training, Everywoman initiated a counseling, job readiness and enrichment training program for persons enrolled in work experience in Niagara County.

Everywoman also provided remediation and vocational assessment to City of Buffalo CETA-eligible women. The city program, funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, began partial operations in early 1980 and was greatly expanded in October of 1980. It was designed to meet the needs of women who needed an intensive program to raise math and reading skills to levels acceptable to employers and trainers. Everywoman's track record in remedial education was impressive. Ninety women were served in FY '81 in three 12 week cycles. Reading scores were raised an average of 1.4 grade levels and math scores an average of 3.0 grade levels in the 12 week cycles. REVA's (Remedial Education/ Vocational Assessment) vocational assessment component helped the women obtain vocational information, job search skills, vocational direction and placement. Of the 90 hard-core unemployed women served in FY '81, 76% have been placed in employment, college or training programs. Funding for this vital program ended on February 28, 1982.

In March of 1981, Everywoman Opportunity Center, Inc. developed a six mouth curriculum of job readiness and job survival skills for persons enrolled in public service employment through the Erie County Employment and Training Consortium.

Working in conjunction with the Private Industry Council, Everywoman provided job-readiness classes and supportive services for women accepted into a training program designed to lead participants into skilled trade apprenticeships with Chevrolet. This eight week program began in April 1981. After training, for the first time women passed both the interview and tests required for acceptance.

Funded by the United Way of Niagara Falls, Everywoman has bee providing counseling services and workshops in employment related areas since September, 1981.

In 1981, Everywoman, Control Data Learning Center and R&W Word Processing were jointly funded by the Private Industry Council to conduct a pilot eight week incentive word processing training program. Everywoman provided the job readiness component of this project and was responsible for placing the graduates in jobs. Due to the success of the pilot program, a second word processing training program was begun in 1982.

In 1983, Everywoman became involved in an innovative pilot project with Head Start of Erie County to provide job readiness training/ skills development/personal enrichment workshops and supportive services to the parents and significant others of Head Start children. This program was so well received that in 1984-85 it was expanded from three sites to six sites.

Everywoman field tested and adapted job readiness materials for parents of Head Start children in 1984-85. The results of this special project, "Exploring Self-Sufficiency", will be published as a model nationwide.

In the fall of 1984, Everywoman was awarded funds to do a New York State Education and Employment demonstartion project in "Displaced Homemaker Prevention" for JTPA eligible youth in Niagara County.

Early in 1985, Everywoman successfully secured JTPA funding to provide employment services to older workers located in the Erie County Partnership area.

In 1986 - Everywoman received a national award from the Coalition of Women and Girls in Education for innovative use of Vocational Education Act Funds in providing service to women. A focus of this program was its creative and cost effective linking with a variety of local agencies and organizations, particularly BOCES and adult education facilities to provide comprehensive services.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you. I appreciate the testimony of all three of you. Let me just ask a few questions, because I know I have kept you all quite a while here today.

Ms. Kelson has described part of the Phoenix Institute's mission as one of getting women to "pay attention to" their worth and potential, apart from their particular spouse.

Now, do you think that the trauma and paralysis that currently beset displaced homemakers will abate as time passes and young women who are now in school gain a better understanding that education and preparation for work are important, even if as an adult they opt to become a full-time homemaker?

Why do we not start with you, Ms. Marano.

Ms. MARANO. I was previously one of the founders of the Displaced Homemakers Network, and one of our dearest hopes in beginning the network was that we be able to do the kind of preventive work along the way that would make it possible for us to say there were not going to be displaced homemakers 40 years hence.

I think all of us would agree—and I will be anxious to hear what my compatriots say—that through title IX and some of the initiatives that are focusing on young women that are coming out of the Perkins Act, we have a better chance at that. But frankly, I do a lot of speaking at college campuses and in communities where young women continue to see a future ahead of them that does not include needing to support themselves.

We have a major public education campaign to do, starting today and certainly going into the future, if we hope to turn around that mindset. I think women continue, young women continue to think that they may work for a while but they still do not have the concept that they are going to be very likely in their lives the financial breadwinner for their families.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Kelson.

Ms. KELSON. I recently was invited to talk to a group of high school students, all girls. I think there were about 250 people in that room, and I ran a little question on them that I do periodically about how many of them expected to work and how long they would expect to work and what they expected to have happen in their lives. And without counting them specifically, I would guess that about 80 to 85 percent of them expected to grow up and be a homemaker and spend their lives raising their children, and that they would be the minority, the exception to the rule; and yet when I drew attention to the fact that most of the young women in that room all expected to do that and statistics showed us differently, there was a universal silence in the room and a stillness that even surprised me.

I do not believe that we have scratched the surface of what has to be done, that in spite of that, title IX has opened many doors—and I am anxious and concerned that it go forth and be renewed—but it is only a beginning step. What has to happen in the educational institutions is a reformation around the thinking of people that are teaching our young women. And it has to start at a very early age, kindergarten.

What is necessary, I do not think any of us really know. I read a statistic in U.S. News the other day that said that they were now predicting that 6 out of every 10 marriages of couples after the age

of 30, I think it was, will end in divorce. That is 60 percent. That is a whole bunch of displaced homemakers.

So I do not think we are anywhere close to it, and I think we have got a lot of work to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Ms. Young.

Ms. YOUNG. I agree with everything that Cindy and Jinnah have said about that. In addition, the problem is so wide-ranging that we have to attack it on so many different fronts. Everywoman Opportunity Center recently did run a displaced homemaker prevention program in which we dealt with teen-aged parents and matched them up with displaced homemakers as mentors. And it was successful, but the attitudes of the young women coming into that program were exactly as has been described. They already had children, they already had been displaced, and they were under 22. And that program is no longer funded.

A school district in our area has contacted everywoman opportunity center, recognizing that they are having many students graduate who are not going on to college, and who have no knowledge of the workplace. They are talking about both men and women, but they are mostly concerned about the young women. Ironically enough, there is no money to fund that either.

We have drained the volunteer resources in my organization to continue providing that education to the younger participants because there is no funding for the kind of education that we are trying to do there.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this: Have you observed any consensus on the type of dependent care women prefer?

For example, do families prefer onsite day-care, babysitters in the home, church sponsored, or some other type?

Why do we not start with you, Ms. Marano.

Ms. MARANO. I believe, and there is some controversy about this in the women's community, that there is not a consensus about the kind of child care that families prefer. There are women who appreciate very much the provision of onsite child care by their employers and others who feel that they would prefer to have their children in child care close to home.

What I think is going to be necessary in terms of an effective Federal child care initiative is a kind of initiative that will provide financial support or tax incentives, substantial tax incentives for people to purchase the kind of child care they want, the kind of quality that they need, at a place that is accessible and convenient for them. I do not think we can as a nation define one kind of child care.

The CHAIRMAN. Do both of you agree with that?

Ms. YOUNG. I agree with that. And the problem is so huge. We recently did a survey in Buffalo and discovered that there were 92,000 children under the age of six whose mothers worked outside the home and 4,000 day-care slots of all kinds. So there are 80 some odd 1,000 children who have no care.

Ms. KELSON. I would only extend it to our experience which is that where there is employer-sponsored child care on the premise or close by that the workers universally, both men and women, take advantage of it and like it and it has proven to decrease turn-

over, decrease absenteeism, and is very highly supported by employers and employees alike.

I think the problem around on-site care is that there has not been enough experience with it by enough people to really collect any kind of universal thinking about it

I also think that churches should be playing a much bigger role in child care than they are and that they have the facilities to provide that child care and could do an excellent job if they would take that responsibility on. I just agree with both Cindy and Myrna that there is a lot needed, just tons of different kinds. Every woman needs their own individualized solution.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me turn to Senator Nickles.

Senator NICKLES. Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment. I apologize that I have not been able to be with you earlier today. We were having a markup in the Energy Committee which I had to participate in.

I do compliment you for the hearing and also our witnesses for some of the alternatives that you have been able to develop in your various sectors of the country. I commend you for that effort, and hopefully we will see greater opportunities and greater developments of those skills. I think it is a very positive move.

And I would also echo the statement from Ms. Kelson as far as seeing greater church involvement. I think that is a very positive alternative that can be used and probably utilized to a much greater extent than it has been in the past.

Excuse me for being late.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Nickles.

Let me just take time to introduce a displaced homemaker who is now an intern on my staff. She is the mother of two children, she just completed her B.A. and will be entering law school in the fall.

We are very proud of her. She is Mary Lynn Massey who is seated right in the back there. Mary Lynn, we are proud of you. If you would stand up just for a second, I think she is a perfect example of success and achievement. Moreover, we are very proud of what you are doing and what you are becoming.

Let me just raise this point, though. There seems to be a lack of reliable data on the displaced homemaker population. It seems to me that that is an area that needs attention, specifically with regard to the number of displaced homemakers who are also economically disadvantaged. Assuming we could obtain that data, would better information regarding the displaced homemaker population change or improve our efforts to assist women in both of these categories? And should funds be devoted to obtaining this data even, say, at the expense of program budgets?

Because, again, you know, there is only so much money out there, and we have to figure out what best to do with it. And every program has its advocates, and I can tell you, every program has its good intentions as far as I can see.

Go ahead, Ms. Marano.

Ms. MARANO. The displaced homemakers network has designed a process through which to gather some of that data, and we would hate to see the Federal program dollars at the moment do that task because the network has taken it on. We believe that good

data will be available by the end of this year related to the numbers of displaced homemakers federally and also in a number of states.

The CHAIRMAN. That is good.

Ms. MARANO. And vocational education dollars have gone for some of this data collection, and we are very excited by the fact that it will be soon available to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just ask you one final question, similar to the one that I asked the first panel. And that is, if you had to identify any single barrier to women which you would consider the biggest stumbling block to women reentering the labor force, what would you say?

Let us start with you, Ms. Young; then we will go to Ms. Kelson and then to Ms. Marano.

Ms. YOUNG. I am sure we are going to echo the first panel. It is money and particularly money for child care.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that right?

Ms. KELSON. Money.

The CHAIRMAN. Strictly money. You agree with child care.

Ms. MARANO. I would like to say that I think that income issues are the issue of women for our panel looking at the transition to more rewarding participation in the work force. The income of women which makes it so difficult to seek training and child care is one piece. And the other is the expectation of the kinds of wages that they are likely to get at the end, the end point of the issue. And you cannot look at women without looking at poverty in the United States.

Ms. KELSON. I would also like to add that the problem of part-time workers, women who are in part-time work that are hanging in there like the proverbial cat on a string, and those women with one little small crisis falling into our program, that they are dedicated, smart, trying women and they are in part-time work without insurance and without any support systems. In adding to what Cindy has said, they have little hope for upward mobility or for breaking that chain.

So the money issue comes in a lot of forms and a lot of ways. It is not only just providing money, which, of course, we all want, and more funding for JTPA and Carl Perkins. But it is in the segregation of occupations, it is in the part-time work, all the barriers that have to do with low pay and dead-end jobs and few choices and not very much available help for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I want to thank you, all the witnesses today, for what I think has been a very provocative, very constructive, and very fruitful hearing. Because we got a lot of suggestions here today and it looks to me like we have a lot of work ahead of us on this committee to try to do some of the things that need to be done.

I kind of envy those who, 20 years ago, just seemed to have unlimited funds and very small deficits to work with and really could attack these problems with a lot more ease than perhaps we can today. But somehow we are going to find some ways to solve some of these problems.

So just keep the ideas coming. Our staffs are available. I think we are open to you. We will be happy to meet with you. Let us see what we can do to alleviate some of these terrible problems.

It has become a matter that is almost consuming in some ways to us on this committee, and I just hope that you will keep helping us. This has been really good today.

I want to compliment each of you for participating, and we appreciate it. We will make sure this record gets disseminated widely. That is what we are doing. We are making a record, and this is a particularly good record. It is one of the best hearings in my ten years in the Congress with regard to resolving problems. I would suggest that it is just the beginning, that you really ought to go back to your respective places of employment and think of as many other ideas as you can and get them to us.

There is a very good spirit on this committee in many ways. We have a lot of conflict because there is a wide disparity of viewpoints. But that also is a great opportunity to bring people together with varying ideas that perhaps will work better. And I think some of the bills that we have come up with have worked much better than the past ones. But I have certainly gotten your message: They need to be refined and reformed and changed. Since a number of them are my bills, I think I will work very hard to do that.

But let us see what can be done, and I just want to thank all of you for being here. It has been a good hearing.

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS
ON THE RE-ENTRY OF WOMEN INTO THE WORKFORCE
before the
UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
April 30, 1986

The American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) appreciates the opportunity to present a statement for the record of the oversight hearing of this Committee on the employment problems faced by midlife and older women. AARP counts among its more than 22 million members above the age of 50 approximately 5 million persons who are actively employed. About half of AARP's members are women. Because midlife and older women face some of the greatest barriers to employment, AARP has a particular interest in the issue being addressed by this Committee.

Women of all ages today enter the labor force due to basic economic need: Few families can be easily supported on the income of one wage-earner. Divorce or widowhood can also displace homemakers and necessitate their entry into the workforce. Perhaps most important, women are faced with the need to provide for their own future financial security. Although women comprise 60% of all older Americans (persons over the age of 65), according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, they account for nearly three-quarters of the elderly poor. Overall, the median income of older women is about half that of older men. Because retirement income is often related to previous

employment and wages, this disparity in income between older women and older men can in part be traced to difficulties faced by women in obtaining employment and adequate wages. Thus, in 1983 only 20% of older women received private pensions, compared to almost 43% of older men, according to the Burueau of the Census. Furthermore, the average annual pension of an older women was only about half ($1560) of that received by older man ($2980). See Pension Rights Center, Women and Prviate Pensions. (1983), p.5.

Midlife and older women face not only employment discrimination based upon age and sex (and, often, race). Age discrimination is an especially difficult problem for these women who seek to re-enter the labor market. Women, particularly displaced homemakers, are often hindered by a lack of training or education in marketable skills and frequent breaks in employment due to family responsibilities. There is an important role to be played by governments, community organizations and schools, and private groups in overcoming discrimination and providing services to assist women in their efforts to obtain well-paying jobs. AARP supports vigorous enforcement of laws prohibiting employment and other discrimination on the basis of age, sex, race and national origin; programs that enhance employment opportunities for midlife and older women through training and education; and legislation to reform current laws and practices that limit the opportunities women have to provide for their own present and future economic security.

The following discussion will highlight some of AARP's legislative and programmatic activities.

1. AARP Legislative Activities

AARP is a strong supporter of laws that prohibit employment and all forms of discrimination. AARP also supports laws that establish education and training programs designed to address the specific employment needs of women, including proposed legislation such as the Economic Equity Act that would both enhance the opportunities for employment for women and increase the value of their employment.

Specifically, AARP supports vigorous enforcement of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Pay Act. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has in the past played an important role in ensuring that these laws are forcefully and effectively implemented and enforced. The EEOC must maintain and expand its efforts. Similarly. AARP is working for passage of the Civil Rights Restoration Act to insure that no federally funded programs or institutions are permitted to discriminate.

AARP also urges full and effective implementation of the provisions of the Job Training Partnership Act intended to benefit economically disadvantaged older workers, as well as those provisions benefiting other individuals who encounter employment barriers, such as older women. Another program that has been of great assistance to low-income women over age 55 is the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). About 65% of the 90,000 low-income SCSEP participants are women, who hold part-time service jobs in their communities. AARP supports continued full funding of SCSEP and its

expansion to include full-time as well as part-time employment. Similarly, AARP supports programs established by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1984 that are designed specifically to provide education and training opportunities for displaced homemakers with a view towards their future employment. AARP also supports legislation to provide guaranteed student loans to students who are matriculated on less than a half-time basis and supportive services (subh as dependant care) to nontraditional students.

AARP supports the package of proposed legislation comprising the "Economic Equity Act." This legislation is critical to enhancing the opportunities and abilities of women to obtain employment and adequate income. For this reason, AARP joined the coalition of organizations that successfuly worked for the passage of health insurance continuation this year. Health insurance continuation will be especially helpful to homemakers who, by reason of death or divorce of their spouse, find themselves forced to acquire the skills necessary to re-enter the workforce.

AARP is also working for passage of reforms in private pension and Social Security systems proposed in the EEA. As noted above, the minimal retirement income received by most older women can often be traced to inadequate employment and wages when younger. Reforms in pension laws to decrease minimum vesting periods and limit integration with Social Security - such as were approved recently by the Senate Finance Committee - will help to overcome this problem. Similarly, reforms requiring greater portability for pension credits, liberalized break-in-employment provisions under ERISA and coverage of part-time workers and workers who begin plan participation within 5 years of

retirement would ease the difficulties faced by those women who have frequent breaks in employment due to their dual roles as homemaker and wage-earner.

Requiring "earnings sharing" of Social Security credits would also ensure that women, who generally earn lower wages than their spouses, are more equitably credited for their economic contributions to a marriage both inside and outside the home, and are not left bereft of a fair share of retirement income in the wake of a divorce.

AARP also supports an expanded dependant care tax credit that would assist the large numbers of women who are responsible for family caregiving and thus are precluded from earning outside income on a regular basis.

Finally, AARP supports proposals that would examine and begin to address the lack of equity in pay between men and women. The "ghettoization" of women, particularly midlife women, into socially valuable but generally low-paying service and support jobs reflects a circle of discrimination that has proven to be difficult to break.

2. AARP Programs

AARP has instituted two wide-ranging programs designed to focus upon the problems faced by, respectively, older workers (the "Worker Equity Initiative") and women (the "Women's Initiative). These two Initiatives have developed a number of joint programs to address the needs of older women in the work force. The first of these is a long-term effort to increase employer awareness of the rich and varied experience and talents the older woman brings to the workplace. AARP is co-sponsoring with ten women's and public policy organizations a

symposium in October 1986, at which thirty business and public policy opinion leaders will consider the unique situations and problems experienced by midlife and older women relative to employment benefits, training and retraining, advancement, re-entry, and retirement. They will analyze and evaluate the need for specific management and benefit services and programs for midlife and older women. Together with related activities, the symposium is designed to increase employers' awareness about the changing demographics of the workplace and the employment trends of mid life and older women.

Second, AARP has begun a five year project for displaced homemakers. The project will provide support and assistance to midlife and older women who are widowed or divorced and are re-entering the labor force, making a career change or are underemployed. As an advocacy adjunct to this project, AARP's Workforce Education Section and Women's Initiative will explore the strategies for increasing the funding, range, and quality of employment and training programs for displaced homemakers. For example, efforts will be made to have States define displaced homemakers as "displaced workers" to meet the eligibility criteria for Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Currently, JTPA grants States a significant amount of flexibility in defining eligible dislocated workers, but very few include displaced homemakers within the category of long-term unemployed workers who are unlikely to find re-employment in the same or a similar occupation.

A third AARP project, "Labor Market Upward Mobility for Midlife and Older Women," will research employment trends through the year 2000 to identify specific occupations that are potentially beneficial

to midlife and older women. There will be a special emphasis on identifying the training necessary to enter these fields and on a feasibility study to determine the most effective method to implement the targeted training programs through existing agencies, organizations and government-funded employment and training programs.

Fourth, AARP is developing a life/work planning program to facilitate re-entry into the labor market by older women. Volunteers at the local level will be provided with curricula for workshops, job counseling and job clubs. These workshops will assist in the formulation of a flexible plan of action for each participant to prepare for changes in employment throughout life; identification of individual skills; and the assessment and selection of realistic personal employment goals. Practical job search, educational and training skills will also be taught. After a limited pilot program, AARP will undertake national implementation in September 1988.

Finally, AARP's Worker Equity Department has published numerous brochures that address problems faced by midlife and older women who work or wish to work, among them "Working Options;" "A Woman's Guide to Pension Rights;" and a bi-monthly newsletter, "Working Age."

The Association will be pleased to keep the Committee informed about the issues and programs discussed herein, or to answer any questions (please contact Michele Pollak, AARP Federal Affairs Department, 202/728-4746). AARP urges the Committee to continue to examine the employment needs and problems of midlife and older women and to support legislation which will help meet these needs and secure the financial futures of all women and their families.

The CHAIRMAN. With that, we will recess this committee until further notice.

[Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

63-226 (164)